
9 999999 007222

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

Early History of North India
The Śakas in India
Social Life in Ancient India
Evolution of Hindu Sects
Traditional Values in Indian Life (Published by India International Centre for Indian National Commission for UNESCO)
Racial Affinities of Early North Indian Tribes
Some Early Dynasties of South India
Dharma O Kusaṃskār (Religion and Superstition in Bengali*)*

The Achaemenids and India

by

Sudhakar Chattopadhyaya



Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd.

Munshiram Manoharlal
Publishers Pvt. Ltd.
54 Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi 110055
Bookshop : 4416 Nai Sarak, Delhi 110006

Second revised edition : July, 1974

PRINTED IN INDIA
By H. L. Gupta at Grantha Bharati, Shahdara, Delhi 110032
and Published by Devendra Jain for Munshiram
Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi-110055

Preface

THE PRESENT book is a revised edition of my earlier work *The Achaemenids in India* which had been out of print for nearly twenty years. I have now utilised the opportunity of discussing the views of R. C. Majumdar, Olmstead and other scholars on the subject, and have incorporated the same in the present edition. The problem whether any part of the Indian sub-continent to the east of the Indus was conquered by Darius the great has been discussed afresh as also the location of *Hidu* or India of Herodotus which has given rise to many theories on the subject.

The publication of the present book has been much delayed due to circumstances beyond my control. Many friends of mine were kind enough to enquire about the progress of the work. It is now for them to judge its merit and demerit.

S. CHATTOPADHYAYA

Santiniketan

Abbreviations

ASIR	*Archaeological Survey of India Report*
BEFEO	*Bulletin de l'Ecole Francaise d'Extreme Orient*, Hanoi
CHI	*Cambridge History of India*
IHQ	*Indian Historical Quarterly*
Ind. Ant.	*Indian Antiquary*
JA	*Journal Asiatique*
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JRAS	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (Britain)
MASI	*Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India*
Mbh.	*Mahābhārata*
PHAI	*Political History of Ancient India*
ZDMG	*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gese llschaft*

to

the sacred feet of

my uncle

Sri Anadi Charan Mukhopadhyaya

Contents

Introductory

INDIA, the central and longest of the three irregular peninsulas of Southern Asia, is a geographical entity, due to its separation from the rest of the continent by the lofty barriers of the Himalayas. This physical barrier has, however, not always proved insurmountable, and while the rich plains of the sacred Bhāratavarṣa have invited the settlements of nomadic hordes from the continent, she, on her part, on the other hand, has often meddled herself in the socio-economic life current beyond her frontiers. Thus there arose in this land a culture peculiar to her own in which we can trace indigenous elements combined with greater Asiatic traditions, and many phases of Indian history can only be properly understood in this Indo-Asiatic background.

India's contact with the areas beyond her border had mainly been maintained through the passes of the north-west, and we may presume that the sea also played some part in this direction.[1] A route ran through Kandahar, Herat, Hekatompylos, Ecbatana and Seleucia and joined a path running through the Kabul Valley and the Khyber Pass.[2] It was mainly through this route, and possibly by another through the Mulla Pass, used in the later days by the Scythian invaders of India,[3] that the Indian caravan leaders carried their commodities to the distant lands. After the conquest of the Indo-Iranian borderland by Cyrus and Darius the Great these routes came into more prominence and after the Macedonian invasion served as the medium through which poured Graeco-Iranian culture on the soil of India.

[1] *JRAS*, 1898, pp. 241-288.

[2] Tarn, *Hellenistic Civilisation*, pp. 193-214. Jouguet, *Macedonian Imperialism*, pp. 93-107, 353. Ray, *Maurya and Śuṅga Art*, p. 15.

[3] Tarn, *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, p. 320. Louis de la Vallee Poussin, *L'Inde aux temps des Mauryas et des Barbares*, p. 235.

The pre-historic Indus Valley civilisation shows India's intimate relationship with the land of Sumer, and the Indian conception of mount Sumeru standing in the middle of the Jambudvīpa seems to be of Semetic origin 'for the earliest occurrence of the word is in an early Semetic legend in the British Museum.'[1] The *Ṛgveda*, the earliest literary monument of the Indo-Aryans, is linguistically connected with the *Avesta*, the earliest document of the Iranians. There is some difference of opinion whether we can detect any direct allusion to Iran in the pages of the *Ṛgveda*. The Parśus mentioned in the work have been included by Kirfel in the list of the Ṛgvedic tribes and it has been understood by many scholars as referring to the Persians and the Pārthavas in *Rv*., vi. 27.8 as alluding to the ancestors of the Parthians, while the name Bālhika mentioned in *Av*., V. 22, 5,7,9 'has been interpreted by some Indic scholars as containing an allusion to ancient Iranian tribes of the Bactrians.' As the *Ṛgveda* refers to Rasā, the river Zaxartes in Central Asia, it is not unlikely that such interpretations are correct ones though Macdonell and Keith refuse to trace any allusions to Iran in the Ṛgveda.[2] The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, of a later date, refers to the twin tribes of *Uttara-Kuru* and *Uttara-Madra* as living beyond the Himalayas

[1] King, *History of Sumer and Akkad*, p. 14, fn. 2.

[2] 'For complete reference to the Vedic passages involved in the discussion, including full bibliographical citations, see Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, I, 29 (Abhyāvartin), 347-9 (Dasyu), 450 (Ninditācva), and especially 504-5 (Parśu), 521-2 (Pārthava); II, 63 (1. Bālhika). Macdonell and Keith join with those Sanskrit scholars who oppose the attempt to find any allusions to Iran in the Veda. The extravagant endeavours of Brunhofer, *Urgeschichte der Arier*, 3 vols., Leipzig, 1893, to identify every remote Vedic term that had a possible geographical content as an Iranian allusion are bizarre in the extreme, even though there are grains of truth in the author's views when he touches more conservatively on the domain bordering between India and Iran. The writer of the present chapter sympathises strongly with certain of the pleas made by the Vedic scholars Ludwig, Hillebrandt, and Weber to recognise Persian allusions in the Ṛgveda; the titles of the special articles on the subject by these scholars are duly cited by Macdonell and Keith in the pages of their *Vedic Index*, referred to above. It seems for sample, that some Avestan student may yet make more use than has been done of the material collected by Hopkins, Prāgāthikāni, I, in *JAOS*, 1896, XVII, 84-92'. *CHI*, p. 288.

(*pareṇa Himavantam*).[1]

These Indian evidences show that Bhāratavarṣa maintained close relationship with the Western and Central Asia since the dawn of history. Non-Indian data also point to the same conclusion, as demonstrated by Kennedy in *JRAS*, 1898, pp. 241-288. Kennedy's view that there were commercial relationship between India and Assyro-Babylonia, via, the Persian Gulf as early as the seventh century BC., and even earlier, is accepted by Olmstead, with certain modifications, who thinks that 'if there was intercourse with India and the (New) East at this early date it must have been overland and not by the sea.'[2]

Arrian affirms that the district to the west of the river Indus as far as the river Kophen (Kabul) was in ancient times subject to the Assyrians, afterwards to the Medes and then to the Persians. Alexander was told by the inhabitants of Gedrosia (Baluchistan) that the Assyrian Queen Semirames, on her flight from India, passed through the tract escaping with twenty men only. Justin says that no one invaded India except Semirames and Alexander. Megasthenes states, however, that Semirames died before carrying out her undertaking.[3]

Very little can be made out of these vague and often contradictory statements of the Classical authors. Expeditions in 808 and 807 BC. against the Mannai mark the most easterly expansion of the Assyrian arms and afford a slight basis for the fabled conquests of Semirames in Bactria and India. India's contact with the Assyro-Babylonian empire also lends colour to such stories. Dr. Winckler points out that Shalmanesar IV of Assyria (727 BC.) received presents from Bactria and India, specially Bactrian camels and Indian elephants, while Rassam found at Birs Nimrud a beam of Indian cedar in the palace of Nebuchadrezzar III of the Neo-Babylonian empire (*c.* 580 BC.), part of which is now exhibited in the British Museum.

[1] *Aitareya Brāhmana*, VIII, 14.

[2] Olmstead, *History of Assyria*, p. 532.

[3] Arrian, *Indica*, I, 3. *Anabasis*, VI, 24.2-3. Justin, *Historiae Philippicae*, I. 2.29. Megasthenes as quoted by Strabo, *Geogr.*, XV, 1.6.

After the fall of Assyria c. 612 BC., Media with its capital at Ecbatana (modern Hamadan) became a political unit of great significance and of vast extent.[1] But there is absolutely no evidence that this Median empire ever succeeded in dominating the Indian-borderland, as Arrian asserts. Varāhamihira in his *Bṛhat-Saṃhitā* (xiv) mentions a colony of the Medas or Medes in India. Herodotus states that the Magi were one of the six tribes of the Medes. In Indian literature we find references to the Magi or Maga-Brāhmaṇas with their Sun cult, but they are described as the Brāhmaṇas of the Śākadvīpa.[2] Ptolemy speaks of the Brakhmanai Magoi as occupying 'the parts under Mount Bettigo.'[3]

The Classical authors, nevertheless, persistently maintain that the region to the west of the Indus did not belong to India. Eratosthenes expressly distinguishes it from India, and Foucher points out that a number of the old local names 'are said to be Iranian.'[4] Anthropologists believe that the Indus is the ethnographical boundary between the Turko-Iranian and the Indo-Aryan types just as in history it has often been the political boundary between Iran and India.

Aśoka's attempt to bring the Yonas, Kambojas and Gandhāras within the orbit of the sacred law also manifests that this region differed culturally from the rest of India. Buddhaghosa states that the Yaunas, Kambojas and other allied people of the frontier lived within the sphere of Persian influence.[5] As Jackson observes: 'The geographical connection between India and Persia historically was a matter of fact that must have been known to both countries in antiquity through the contiguity of their territorial situation. The realms which correspond to-day to the buffer states of Afghanistan and Baluchistan found always a point of contact and were concerned in antiquity with Persia's advances into Northern and North-Western India as well as, in a far less degree, with

[1] McGovern, *The Early Empires of Central Asia*, pp. 61-62.
[2] Herodotus, I, 101. *Mbh*, VI, 11. *Matsya Purāṇa*, ch. CXXII.
[3] *Ptolemy*, ed. McCrindle, p. 167.
[4] *JA*, 1331, p. 358.
[5] Ray, *Maurya aud Śuṅga Art*, p. 47.

any move of aggrandisement on the part of Hindustān in the direction of Iran.'[1]

Thus when the Achaemenids conquered and established their rule on the Indian borderland, they had been dealing with a region already known to them not only through trade and commerce but also by a semi-common tie of culture. The history of this conquest is unfolded by a series of inscriptions left by the Achaemenid monarchs themselves,[2] and by incidental references in the works of the Classical authors. The last named source, however, is defective inasmuch as they are late and mainly based on hearsay evidences. Even the works of Herodotus and Ctesias, who lived in the Achaemenid epoch, are inferior in quality to the evidences furnished by the epigraphs, for Herodotus' knowledge of India was very poor and the work of Ctesias is full of 'old wives' tales.' The proper method, therefore, to study the Indo-Achaemenid history would be to base the account primarily on the materials supplied by the epigraphs and then to corroborate or supplement them by the notices from the Classical works.

It will probably be not out of place here to mention a few facts bearing on the condition of the Indian borderland on the eve of the Achaemenid conquest. Already a passage of the *Atharvaveda*, well-known to the scholars, consigns Takman or fever to the Gandhāris along with other people like the Mujavants, the Aṅgas and the Magadhas. This shows that the land of the seven rivers, sacred to the writers of the Ṛgvedic hymns, has fallen in the estimation of the later Indo-Aryans, and a similar account in the *Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra* enjoins that one should perform purificatory ceremonies if per chance he goes to the land of the Āraṭṭas etc.[3] These statements show that there prevailed in the post-Ṛgvedic age two

[1] *CHI*, p. 287.

[2] The Achaemenid records have been edited and translated by Sen in his *Old Persian Inscriptions*. See also in this connection *MASI*, no 34. Buck, *Language*, 1927. *JAOS*, II, p. 330. Tolman. *Old Persian Lexicon and Texts and Cuneform Supplement*; Thompson, *The Inscription of Darius the Great at Behistun*, 1907. Ogden, *A Note on the Chronology of the Behistun Inscription of Darius*, *Pavry Memorial Volume*, pp. 361-365.

[3] *Atharvaveda*, V, 22.14. *Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra*, I, 2.14.

distinct types of cultures, one in the Uttarāpatha and another in the Madhyadeśa, and it has besn inferred from this that there were two invasions of the Indo-Aryans in India,[1] one representing the long-headed Nordic Indo-Europeans proper, and another consisting of the broad-headed Alpines, Dinaries and Armenoids.[2] The second Aryan invasion is believed to have taken place in the post-Ṛgvedic age, and in fact, it appears from the anthropological and linguistic data, that the Aryan speech came in various waves from the west and gradually spread over the length and breadth of India.[3]

[1] Chanda, *Indo-Aryan Races*.

[2] B.S. Guha has divided the Indian people into six main races with nine sub-types as follows:

1. The Negrito
2. The Proto-Australoid
3. The Mongoloid, consisting of:
   (i) Palae-Mongoloids of (a) long-headed and (b) broad-headed types
   (ii) Tibeto-Mongoloids
4. The Mediterranean, comprising :
   (i) Palae-Mediterranean
   (ii) Mediterranean and
   (iii) the so-called Oriental type
5. The Western Brachycephals, consisting of:
   (i) the Alpinoid
   (ii) the Dinaric, and
   (iii) the Armenoid
6. The Nordic (*Racial Elements in the Population*, p. 8).

[3] For a criticism of the double Aryan invasion theory *cf.* author's Presidential Address, Indian History Congress, Section I, 1964. In fact, the difference between the Inner Band and the Outer Band can be explained by the theory of intermingling of various sub-groups mentioned by B.S. Guha. The expression *saṃkīrṇayoni*, as used in the *Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra*, means 'hybrids against caste rules' and Bodhāyana's account seems to indicate that the Aryans of the Outer Band became *varṇa-saṃkara* among themselves and were consequently looked down upon by the orthodox Midlanders. The Gāndharva form of marriage mentioned in the *Śrauta*- and *Dharma* works is a pointer to this direction. Such marriages were evidently in vogue in the Gandhāra country. In the Sabhāparvan (31.37-8) of the *Mahābhārata*, it is stated that through the favour of the god Agni, the women of the Māhismatī region could do whatever they liked and that they could not be restrained in any way. The Karṇaparvan (VIII, 45.50) condemns the people of the Aṅga country as sellers of

Thus it appears that the borderland of India was the one spot where bands of tribes had been constantly migrating from Central and Western Asia, and as such a disturbing condition prevailed in that area. Another Aryan group that possibly migrated a little before the conquest of the Achaemenids is represented by the speakers of the Dardic language, believed by some to be descended from the Aryan dialect of the Alpine broad-heads, under which come speeches of the extreme North-West of India, viz., Kashmiri, Shina and a few others like Chitrali, Bashgali and Pashai.

The Achaemenids at once caught hold of the opportunity offered by this disturbing condition and extended their arms to India. In this they might have been helped by the Iranians of this area, for the Ṛgveda refers to the Pakhtas of the North-West, the Pactyce of Herodotus, the modern Pashtus, and scholars are unanimous that Pashtu belongs to the Iranian group of language, like Baluchi, each in two dialects.

their own wives. These examples demonstrate that indiscriminate inter-marriages were going on in the Outer Band countries and that this resulted in the rise of the *saṃkīrṇayonis*.

Chapter 1

The Rule of the Achaemenids in India

ON THE TERM KA(N)BUJIYA—KAMBOJA

THERE are five Columns at Behistun containing the inscriptions of the Achaemenid king Darius the Great. The Fifth Column seems to contain the inscriptions executed in the third year of his reign, *i.e.*, 519-18 BC., while the first four record his achievement of the first year (*cf.* O P. phrase *hamahyaya(h) tharda(h)* and may have been possibly executed at the beginning of 519 BC.

In Column I, Darius gives a list of 25 countries 'that came to' him. In this list we find two names that are Indian, *viz.*, Ga(n) dāra or Gandhāra and Qatagus or Sattagydia. The location of Sattagydia has not yet been properly determined. Cunningham thinks that it is identical with Opian, which is near the old *janapada* of Kāpiśa, and which was sometimes included in the latter. Herzfeld, on the other hand, thinks that it was the Punjab. "The word (Qatagus) would signify 'having hundred heads of cattle.' But the name is Indian as well as the Persian with the same meaning : Śatagu—and as all the foreign renderings have the S in the beginning, we may consider it as an Iranisation of the originally Indian name."[1] Where then this Indian Śatagu country can be? I propose to identify it with the valley of the river Gomati (the Gomal), mentioned since the Ṛgvedic age, for Gomati means "abounding in cows,' exactly the same sense conveyed by the term Śatagau.[2]

The location of Gandhāra is well-known. In the Achaemenid days it seems to have comprised the Kabul Valley and extended

[1] *MASI*, no. 34, p. 3.

[2] The identification was first suggested by me in *IHQ*, 1949, p. 189 and I am glad to find that some later writers have accepted it.

in the north to the hills of Swat and Bunir. The Jātakas and the *Rāmāyaṇa* inform us that the *janapada* of Gandhāra extended on both the sides of the river Indus, and while the eastern part had its capital at Takṣaśilā, the capital of the western part was Puṣkalāvatī. In the east, the *janapada* evidently extended as far as the Ravi, for Strabo locates the little kingdom of Gandaris, ruled by the Younger Poros at the time of Alexander's invasion of India, between the Chenub and the Ravi. The Punjab, thus, was Persian from the middle of the sixth century onward.

These two countries Gandhāra and Śatagu must have been inherited by Darius from his predecessors, for, as he repeatedly says in the Behistun record, he took over the Achaemenid empire in a state of complete disintegration after the death of Cambyses, and had to suppress nine serious rebellions in course of one year, and hence had little time to make fresh conquests.

Gandhāra and Śatagu, were, therefore, conquered either by Cyrus, the founder of the Achaemenid empire, or his successor Cambyses, who was succeeded by Darius the great. Cambyses ascended the throne amidst troubles, 'when province after province was revolting and securing independence and we have good grounds for supposing that the Eastern Iranians also succeeded from breaking away Persian control.'[1] Cambyses was thus throughout engaged in maintaining peace and order in his own empire, and it proves indirectly that Gandhāra and Śatagu were conquered by Cyrus himself.

In his *History of the Persian Empire*, pp. 144f, Olmstead also maintains that 'since the days of Cyrus, Gandara had formed the easternmost conquest of the Achaemenids, the only Indian territory yet under their sway.' Elsewhere, the same scholar observes that, "from Bactria, the most eastern of the truly Iranian lands, Cyrus looked across the boundary river, the Cophen, into the territory of their cousins, the Indians. At this time the Iranians still called it in their own language Paruparaesanna, the land 'beyond the mountains', although it was known to the natives as Ga(n)dara. At this date, then,

[1] McGovern, *The Early Empires of Central Asia*, p. 62.

this far corner of India first came under the control of the Iranians. Along the lower slopes of the Hindu Kush, the 'mountains' referred to by the Iranian name, stretched Thattagush or Sattagydia; north of them, in the Pamirs, were the Saka Haumavarga or Amyrgaean Sacae, 'preparers of the (sacred) *haoma* drink."[1]

Dr. R.C. Majumdar first struck a note of difference to this view which had already been endorsed by other writers. He points out that there is hardly any positive evidence to 'credit Cyrus with the conquest of the trans-Indus borderlands in the region round Peshawar.' Among the Classical authors Xenophon states that 'Cyrus brought under his rule Bactrians and Indians', while Arrian writes in his *Indika* that 'the regions beyond the river Indus on the west are inhabited, up to the river Kophen, by two Indian tribes, the Astakenoi and the Assakenoi......They were in old times subject to the Assyrians, then after a period of Median rule submitted to the Persians, and paid to Cyrus, the son of Cambyses, the tribute from their land which Cyrus had imposed.'[2]

According to Dr. Majumdar while the statement of Xenophon is utterly vague, for some tribes in Afghanistan were actually called Indians who lived bordering the Bactrians, the statement of Arrian referring to the successive conquests of Afghanistan by the Assyrians and Medes remains uncorroborated by any other source which also does not support the legend about Cyrus. Further it may be noted that there is a statement of Nearchus to the effect that 'Cyrus planned an

[1] pp. 48-9; Olmstead points out that the Iranian name Paruparaesanna "is preserved in the Babylonian and Elamite versions of the official inscriptions in place of Gandara; according to Jackson, *Cambridge History of India*, I, 327, it is the Avestan Upairisaena, 'higher than the eagle'; Paropamisus, Eratosthenes, in Strabo, XV, 1.11; 2.8ff.; Arr. *Anab.* V. 5.3; *Ind.* 2. 3; the more usual form is Parapamisadae with numerous variants, Just. XII, 5.9; Diod. XVII, 82.1; Curt. VII, 3.5; Arr. *Anab.* III, 28.4. Gazaca, 'Treasure City', Ptol. VI, 18, among the Parapamisadae; Amm. XXIII, 6.70; medieval Ghazni." *l.c.*, fn. 85.

[2] In his *Political History of Ancient India*, p. 193, Dr. Raychaudhuri takes it as an evidence of the rule of the Persian monarch over the Indian borderland. Olmstead also seems to maintain a similar view though his statements are not very clear. *l.c.*, pp. 48-49.

expedition against India through Gedrosia (Beluchistan) but lost his entire army, excepting seven men in that region. Herodotus and Megasthenes are also absolutely silent regarding the Indian conquest of the Achaemenid monarch.'[1]

Indeed, if we take the evidences of the Classical authors only we can hardly conclude that Cyrus brought under him any part of the Indian region. But we have to consider very critically what the significance of the statement in the Behistun record is. Thus in Column I Darius says 'these countries that came to me; by the will of Ahura Mazda I was their king.'[2] Then follows a list of twenty-three names which includes Ga(n)dara and Qatagus. This stands in great contrast to the statement of his Naksh-i-Rustam inscription stating 'by the will of Ahura Mazda these are the countries that I seized afar from Persia. I over them ruled. (They) brought me tribute.'[3] The difference in language of the two records should be noted. The first, *i.e.*, Column I of the Behistun record notes his inheritance while the second one, the smashing of a 'revolt in the empire already hinted in Column II of the Behistun record.' The evidence of a contemporary epigraph is certainly more important than the classical accounts of later days.

The name of Cambyses (O.P. Ka(m)bujiya) has, however, been linked with the frontier people of Kamboja by Hoffman and others. Levi makes the interesting observation that Kāpiśa and Kamboja seem to be two attempts 'to render the same foreign word in a language which did not lend itself to the purpose: Ka (*Kam*)=Kdm. p s (*bj*) each has a labial followed by palatal; unvoiced in the first case and sonant in the second; the middle term seems to have been in the two cases a spirant: f and z both of which are wanting in Sanskrit. The spirant appears in Greek also, in the sibilant of the proper name Kambyses=Ka(n)bujiya, the son of Cyrus, of whom the name probably recalled one of the conquests of his father, the destructor of Kāpiśa.'[4]

[1] *IHQ*, 1949, p. 155.
[2] S. Sen, *Old Persian Inscriptions*, p. 6.
[3] *Ibid*, p. 98.
[4] *Pre-Aryan Pre-Dravidian in India*, trans. P.C. Bagchi, p. 120.

If we, then, follow the lead of the French savant, we have to admit that the region extending from Kāpiśa to Kamboja became Iranian at a very early date. Column III of the Behistun inscription refers to the fortress of *Kāpisākāni*, within the jurisdiction of the satrap of Arachosia, and here a great battle was fought in which the army of the Achaemenid king became victorious 'by the grace of Ahura Mazda.' Kapiśa or Kāpiśa is mentioned in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini, and refers no doubt to the country of Ka-pi-shi of Yuan Chwang in the neighbourhood of Balkh. It was famous for its vine-yards, now as in ancient times, as is shown by the example by which the *Kāśikāvṛtti* explains the rule, and we observe that the soldiers of Raghu also relieved themselves from their fatigue with the liquor of that country rich in vine-yards.[1] It is also referred to in the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya. We have several coins of the Indo-Greek kings bearing the legend '*Kavisiye nagara devatā.*' From the account of Yuan Chwang, it appears that Kāpiśa comprised the whole of Kafiristan as well as the two large valleys of Ghorband and Panjsir.[2]

Konow proposes to identify Kāpiśa with Ki-pin mentioned in the Chinese texts (*Han Shu*, 96*a*, 10-12). There has been much dispute regarding the exact denotation of the term Ki-pin. Some scholars e.g., Weiger, Charpentier, Gutschmid and others would identify it with the Kabul or Kophen river basin making it thus identical with Kabulistan. This identification, though recently advocated afresh by Tarn, is certainly wrong, because in the Han period the Kabul river basin was known by another name *viz.*, Kao-fu. Lassen and Herzfeld have tried to locate Ki-pin further to the south in Arachosia or Southern Afghanistan. But a critical study of the Chinese texts would show that this view is hardly tenable. Chavannes points out that whereas in the later times Ki-pin equals Kapisa or the lower Kabul Valley, in the Han period it is equivalent to Kashmir. In fact, the term Ki-pin has always been used in a rather loose sense to denote either the whole or a part of the

[1] *Kāśikāvṛtti* on Pāṇini, IV, 2.99. Watters, *On Yuan Chwang*, vol. 1, p. 122. *Raghuvaṃśaṁ*, iv, 65.

[2] *Indian Studies Presented to Prof. Rapson*, p. 333.

region extending from Kāpiśa to Kashmir. Some of the Chinese texts define Ki-pin as being bounded on the south-west by Wu-i-shan-li (Arachosia), and on the north-west by the Bactrian kingdom of Ta-yue-chi, while on the north-east it was nine days journey to Kan-tou, and on the east 2250 li to Wu-cha.[1]

To turn now to the discussion of the term Kamboja, Yāska says that the Kambojas use the √*śab* instead of √*gam* in the sense of going. *Śavati* does not occur in Sanskrit, but it is a good Iranian word. There is the old Persian √*siyav*—and the Avestan √*sav*, *savate*, to go *cf.* Persian *sudam*, Skr.√*cyav*. Grierson in his *Linguistic Survey of the Badakhasan and the Pamir Regions* points out that the Signi tribe uses the term *suta* in the sense of 'going' ; the Sarkel tribe uses the word *set* in the sense of 'to go' ; *suhat* for 'gone' and *sauma* for 'will go' ; the Mungi tribe uses the term *siah* for 'to go.' All these tribal words can be traced to the √*śab*. Thus traces of the old Kamoja tribe exist at the present day in the Badakhasan and the Pamir regions. In the west, the tribe, in the ancient days, seems to have extended as far as the eastern part of Afghanistan, for here we find peoples who call themselves Kamboja and Kaumji, in which we can trace probably the survival of the name Kamboja.

It has been pointed out that the following *gāthā* from the Pali *Jātaka* 'by itself establishes a close connection between the Kambojas and the ancient Iranians, with whom the destruction of the noxous or Ahramanic creatures was a duty.

'Those men are counted pure who only kill
Frogs, worms, bees, snakes or insects as they will...
These are your savage customs which I hate
Such as Kamboja hordes might emulate.'[2] (VI. 110).

The Kamboja is mentioned in the edicts of Aśoka along with the Gandhāra and the Yona as an 'anta' or semi-independent border country. If we accept the view of Senart that the outlying provinces have been enumerated in R.E. XIII in a definite order, then the Kamboja country, in the days of the great Mauryan emperor, must have been contiguous to that of the

[1] *ZDMG*, 1906.
[2] *JRAS*, 1912, p. 256.

Yavanas, for the Yavanas and the Kambojas are mentioned one after another in the epigrah. In the *Mahābhārata* also the Kambojas are associated with the Gandhāras and the Yavanas.[1] From the same epic we learn that Karṇa, in course of his *digvijaya*, went to Rājapura and defeated the Kambojas. This Rājapura has been identified with the Rājapura of Yuan Chwang which lay to the south or south-east of Punch, near the Jhelum river, *i.e.*, the modern Rajaori.[2] Thus the Kamboja country abutted to some extent on the Bāhika land, or the region watered by the Indus and her five tributaries.

From a careful study of the anthropological data, Sir Herbert Risley classified the Indian humanity into seven main physical types, and one of them is the 'Turko-Iranian' type which comprises the Baloches, Brahuis and Afghans of Baluchistan and the N. W. Frontier Province.[3] These are probably the result of a fusion of Persian and Turki (it came at a later stage) blood. The area covered by these tribes formed a part of the great Achaemenid empire. (*Cf.* B.S. Guha's account noted above).

[1] *Mbh*, XII, 207.43.

[2] *PHAI*, p. 126.

[3] Risley, *The People of India*, p.7

Chapter 2

The Reign of Darius I The Great (521-485 BC.)

IN Column II of the Behistun record, Darius gives the name of nine countries, which revolted against him, when he was in Babylon. In this list we find the name of Śatagu. In this connection, it may be noted that after giving the names of 23 countries, which include Gandhāra and Śatagu, in Column I, Darius says : 'These countries which went away from me, by the will of Ahura Mazda became submissive to me (and) bore my tribute.'

It follows, therefore, that Gandhāra and Śatagu joined in the general revolt against Darius, after his accession to the throne, and later on Śatagu revolted again, but was brought to submission.

The extensive sculptures at Behistun exhibit among other things the figures of the nine chiefs, whom Darius had successfully overthrown. The inscriptions appended to these figures, however, do not mention the chief of Śatagu, though it gives the names of the chiefs of other revolting areas. It omits Śatagu, and includes Skuntha, the chief of the European Scyths, whom Darius possibly conquered in the third year of his reign.

Besides Gandhāra and Śatagu, the Hamadan, Persepolis and the Naqsh-i-Rustam inscriptions of Darius mention another Indian people, Hidu, as included in his empire. As Herzfeld says 'The Hidu was thus a fresh conquest by Darius himself, later than the Behistun inscription. We know that Darius passed the year 517 in Egypt, and that this and the following year saw the establishment of the Persian rule in other African countries. Since the Hamadan inscription, as well as the foundation inscription of the terrace of Persepolis, both

mention the Hidu, but not the European Scyths, and since the years 517 to 515 are fully occupied, the conquest of Sind is limited to the years 519 and 518.' Smith thinks that Hidu or the Satrapy of India 'must have comprised......the course of the Indus from Kalabagh to the sea, including the whole of Sind, and perhaps included a considerable portion of the Punjab east of the Indus.' The preliminaries to this conquest are described by Herodotus, who says that Darius first sent a fleet down the river Indus to the sea and then conquered 'India.' But it is more probable that the Achaemenid emperor conquered and consolidated the region and then ordered the navigation of the river, possibly for purposes of trade, for, otherwise, the party ran the risk of attack, which a great conqueror like Alexander the great was unable to avoid in the later days.

Darius possibly conquered Hidu in course of his military expedition, which he undertook to suppress the rebellions of Gandhāra and Śatagu. It was not an isolated military phase of the great Achaemenid, but part of the great expedition, which he undertook between 521 and 519 BC. Parts of the Behistun inscription, in that case, may have been executed while the campaign was in progress, while the Hamadan inscription, which first mentions the Hidu, was epigraphed after the peace was restored in the empire.

The description of Hidu (India) left by Herodotus causes some difficulty inasmuch as it shows on the one hand that the satrapy evidently comprised the lower coast of the Indus which on the other is incompatible with the statement that it paid the highest tribute of 360 Euboic gold talents per year, the largest sum paid by any of the Satrapies. Gold can nowhere be found in the Sind region, while Herodotus himself says that there were various groups of Indians and one such group 'who lived on the border of the city Caspatyrus and the country of Pactyica—the part of India where lies the sandy desert from which they procure the gold dust.' Herodotus evidently confused this India which paid the highest tribute in gold with India of the lower Indus valley. Nothing however can be said definitely and confusion will remain till fresh light comes from

other sources. (For a discussion of Caspatyrus and Pactyica, see *infra*).

We now turn to the much debated question, whether the Achaemenid dominion extended to the east of the Indus. Thus the writers of the *Cambridge Ancient History*, IV, p. 183 observe: 'The Persian province of India scarcely extended east of the Indus; but it paid in tribute far more than any of the other provinces, and is likely therefore to have included a very considerable tract of country between the mountains that separate Afghanistan from India.' Olmstead's view is not very clear for he simply states that the empire included only the territories 'along the banks of the Indus and its affluents.'[1] For the first time in 1949, Dr. R.C. Majumdar discussed the views of the earlier writers and came to the conclusion that the theory of the extension of the Achaemenid empire to the east of the Sindhu 'is at best a mere hypothesis.'[2]

We can possibly get some clue to the solution of our problem if we discuss here the location of Gandhāra, the Gandhāra of the Persian records. In ancient Indian literature Gandhāra is described either as lying to the west of the Indus or on both the sides of the river.[3] Now, from the time of Alexander's invasion all the foreign authors confine the *Janapada* to the west of the Indus. This seems to show that Gandhāra extended on both the sides of the great river with its eastern capital at Takṣaśilā (Taxila) and western capital at Puṣkalāvatī (Prang and Charsadda) evidently in the pre-Alexander days, and if this view be accepted it is not unlikely that the Gandhāra kingdom of the Achaemenids included Taxila at least. In this connection we may note the Aramaic inscription of Aśoka discovered at Taxila and also another fragmentary Aramaic inscription in the Swat valley.[4] As Marshall observes: 'As a medium for official communication throughout the empire the government of Susa had adopted

[1] *l. c.*, p. 145.
[2] *IHQ*, 1949, p. 163.
[3] *Rāmāyana*, VII, 113.11 ; 114.11.
[4] Barnett, 'An Aramaic Inscription from Taxila', *JRAS*, 1915, pp. 340-41. Cowley, 'The First Aramaic Inscription from India', *JRAS*, 1915, pp. 324ff. Herzfeld, *Epigraphia Indica*, XIX (1928) 350 ff.

Aramaic speech and writing, both of which had been used in Babylonia and Assyria side by side with cuneiform, and in this way the Aramaic alphabet—and to some extent, no doubt, the Aramaic speech—came to be employed by the native population at Taxila and in the North-West......We must also conclude that Aramaic continued to serve as an official language at Taxila long after the city had ceased to be part of the Persian empire.'[1]

Two factors may be cited as going against such an assertion: *first*, according to Megasthenes and others the Indians 'never sent an expedition abroad nor were their country invaded and conquered except by Heracles and Dionysos in old times and by the Macedonians in our own';[2] and *secondly*, according to Buddhist calculations, based in the background of the Cantonese documents, Pukkusāti, king of Takṣaśilā, was a contemporary of Cyrus and Darius and this makes Darius'

[1] Marshall, *Taxila*, I, p. 15; Olmstead makes the following interesting observation in this connection: 'The mound which covers the ruins of the pre-Greek settlement at Taxila has been identified and excavated. Few objects of the Achaemenid period have been recovered, but much indirect light has come. For instance, an inscription from the reign of the Buddhist Aśoka, who almost immediately followed the last Darius, is written in beautifully engraved Aramaic characters of the later fourth century and shows the same combination of Aramaic and Persian formulas which must have been employed in the royal chancellery of the time; it is proof of the Aramaic origin of the familiar Kharoṣṭhī writing of the immediately succeeding period.

In the second stratum, representing the later Achaemenid and early Macedonian periods, was found a great hoard of coins. A single well-worn daric alone proves continuing relations with the Persian homeland, but more than a thousand punch-marked coins in silver illustrate the earliest native coinage, ranging from tiny bits averaging little over two grains (which might have been imitated from those of the Lydians), to oblong bent bars cut from imported silver sheets or to polygonal, square, and round true coins; their weight alone proves relation to Persia, for they represent quarter, half and double *silver* shekels. Of such a character was the silver offered by the ruler of Taxila to Alexander.' (*i.e.*, pp. 381-2). Since the time of Marshall further excavations have been carried out at Gandhāra and other sites, but if we do not attach much importance to a few Darics there is no stratum that can be definetely called Achaemenid, or which is associated with any definite Achaemenid evidence.

[2] Megasthenes, fg. XLVI, ed. McCrindle, p. 109.

sway over Takṣaśilā improbable.[1]

It may be noted here that by the term India Megasthenes and later Classical authors meant the sub-continent lying to the east of the Indus and if we take the account of Megasthenes and his followers in its face value our inferences fall through at once. But when we note that such authors had a tendency to extol Alexander and to show that no person could equal him in prowess there arises a necessity to examine these texts and to determine how far they are really acceptable. Such texts have been translated by McCrindle in his *'The Invasion of India by Alexander the Great'*, 2nd ed., Westminster, 1896. These are supposed to be based on the accounts left by the historians, who accompanied Alexander, and those left by Megasthenes, who was an ambassador of Seleucus Nicator in the court of Candragupta Maurya. In their present form then they are of 'much later' date, evidently containing interpolations and additions by later writers. Up to the present time, all the historians have put implicit faith in them, but this can hardly be called strictly 'historical' method. An instance may be noted here. These texts describe in glowing terms the submission of the hill-state of Nysa to Alexander, who, it is alleged, paid a visit to the mountain of the land. Philostratos, however, avers that 'the inhabitants of Nysa deny that Alexander ever went up to the mountains' and adds that 'the companions of Alexander did not write down the truth in reporting this.' (Appollonius, Bk II, Ch. 9). Thus it appears that there are yet numerous errors to be corrected and that the whole history of Alexander's Indian episode must be set right.

[1] If we calculate in the background of the Cantonese tradition, Bimbisāra's reign period would extend from *c.* 546 BC. to *c.* 494 BC. We know that king Pukkusāti of Takṣaśilā sent him an embassy and a letter showing that the two monarchs were contemporaries. But this in no way goes against our assertion regarding Darius' empire, for it is evident that Darius conquered the eastern portion of Gandhāra after he received the report of Scylax about 519-18 BC. The conquest happened during the last days of Pukkusāti or just after his reign; see also *infra.* for further discussions.

The following chiefly are the Classical authors dealing with Alexander's exploits in India:

(a) Diodorus (100 BC-100 AD) who has mixed up history with fiction.

(b) Strabo (60 BC-19 AD) who says that he himself has corrected the accounts of the previous writers, but admits at the same time that his knowledge of India is very poor.

(c) Curtius (*c.* 100 AD), 'who was deficient in knowledge of geography, chronology and astronomy' (McCrindle, p. 11).

(d) Plutarch (46 AD-120 AD) whose *Lives*, especially those of Crassus and Antony, though based on first rate sources, is of little value for the history of Alexander's exploits in India as it is marred with patriotic bias.

(e) Arrian (AD 200) who is credited to be the best of Alexander's historians by McCrindle.

(f) Justin (not later than 500 AD) to whom accuracy 'is of small importance compared with the chance of drawing a moral lesson.'

It is thus apparent that our 'sources' are secondary, late in date and defective. As regards Arrian, he hardly deserves so much credit as McCrindle gives him. Thus Arrian makes king Pharasmanes say to Alexander that his kingdom bordered on the Colchians (IV. 15. 4), but as Droysen points out 'it was nonsense' (p. 66). These writers again used accounts which were not very trustworthy. The chief sources of these Classical authors are the following:

(i) The work of Nearchos, who is considered by the later writers as an honest reporter, 'who took pains to verify the stories which were told him.' But the account is lost, and the few quotations that survive, may or may not be genuine all through.

(ii) The work of Onesicritus, who was the pilot of the royal vessel during Alexander's return march. Strabo considered him untruthful.

(iii) Aristobulous, who was entrusted with a commission by Alexander (Arrian, VI. 29.10). 'His interest was predominantly geographical, not military : yet his book seems to

have been adversely affected by the rhetorical fashion and perhaps by the Alexander myth which had already begun to take popular shape at the times when he wrote.'

(iv) Clitarchus of Colophon, who wrote a history of Alexander of a highly journalistic character and often basing his accounts on imagination.

(v) The work of Megasthenes, which is lost and survives in the quotations of later writers. As Dr. Stein says 'the useful portion of Megasthenes' report is very meagre and its authority cannot be taken as absolute.'[1]

Thus the 'sources' which we have at our disposal for reconstructing Alexander's exploits in India are for the most part based on defective accounts, and hence we have to proceed very cautiously in dealing with this topic. The Classical authors would make us believe that in the east Alexander advanced as far as the Beas, but we have reasons to question the veracity of the statement. Alexander received the submission of Taxila and Abhisāra (Poonch and Nowshera districts), but seems to have been immediately faced by a confederacy of Indian powers headed by Poros and failed to proceed further. It was a confederacy of the Malloi, the Oxydrakoi, the republican ones, and other monarchical states that stopped the further advance of the Macedonian hero. The following notices of the Classical authors force upon us this conclusion.

First, Arrian informs us that Alexander built an Alexandria at the confluence of the Chenub and the Indus, and this was the easternmost canton founded by Alexander in India. 'The places called Alexandropolis......must be military colonies which claimed to go back to Alexander' (Tarn). If Alexander had conquered the region up to the Beas, it is but natural that he would have constructed a 'fort' or established a military colony there to guard against the 'Prasii and the Gangaridae' who were constant threats to the Greek power. We may note in this connection the position of Alexandria in the Scythian land, somewhere in Kujhend, which marked the farthest limit of Alexander's advance in Central Asia.

[1] Stein, *Megasthenes und Kautilya* p. 297.

Secondly, Justin says that Alexander 'out of respect for his valour restored Poros in safety to his sovereignty' (XII. 8). Poros inflicted a heavy loss on the Macedonian garrison, and, as we know from other cases, Alexander would not let such a person go free (*cf. the case of Bessus*). The war was evidently a drawn game, and Poros was able to maintain his own position. The Classical authors have evidently twisted the facts to glorify their own hero.

Thirdly, Plutarch says, 'The battle with Poros depressed the spirit of the Macedonians and made them very unwilling to advance further into India' (McCrindle, p. 310), and they advanced only when pressed by Alexander. Can we not suspect here that really the Macedonians went up to the battlefield of Poros, and the latter part of the statement forms a part of Alexander myth'?

We have again an Ethiopic version,[1] ignored by most of the modern scholars, showing that Alexander was defeated by Porus, but the Classical authors speak of his victory over the Indian king. Here we are not concerned with Alexander's exploits in India, but it must be noted that any Classical account contrasting the exploits of the Persians with that of the Macedonians should be used with caution and cannot at once be taken for writing sober history.

We now turn to the second objection. According to the Buddhist account Pukkusāti, king of Takṣaśilā, sent an embassy and a letter to king Bimbisāra of Magadha and he also defeated Pradyota, king of Avanti. Dr. R. C. Majumadar points out 'as Pradyota was a contemporary of both Bimbisāra and his son Ajātaśatru, he did not probably come to the throne before 540 or 530 BC, and Pukkusāti also may be regarded as ruling in Gandhāra about that time. He would be thus a contemporary of Cyrus who established his power and authority in 549 BC and died twenty years later in 529 BC. On general grounds, therefore, we can hardly credit Cyrus with the conquest of trans-Indus borderlands in the region round Peshawar.'[2] This may be cited as an instance against the inclusion of Takṣaśilā within the

1 *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*, 1938, p. 88.
2 *IHQ*, 1949, p. 154.

empire of Cyrus though he may be credited with the conquest of the Peshawar region, *i.e.*, the western portion of the Gandhāra *janapada*. It should however, be noted that any chronological scheme based on such accounts is not a fullproof one and if Pradyota had been ruling, say in 535 BC, he will be a contemporary of both Pukkusāti and Cyrus. It should be noted, however, that the Pali account does not mention any successor of Pukkusāti which in face of the Achaemenian epigraphic evidences, noted before, can only mean that his authority came to an end under the pressure of Cyrus. It is not unlikely that he ruled for a few more years on this side of the Indus in the Taxila region which ultimately passed under Darius, for, as already stated, Darius would not have sent a naval expedition along the Indus unless he had both sides of the river under his control; for, otherwise, it would have been open to attack from the rear.

The Greek geographer Hecataeus, who lived in the days of Darius says that a tribe called the Opiai 'dwell by the river Indus, and there is a royal fort. Thus far the Opiai extends and beyond there is a desert as far as the Indus.' Opiai must be identical with Opian, the capital of the ancient Kāpiśa country, where there was possibly a fort of the great king Darius. Column III of the Behistun record actually refers to the fortress of Kāpisakāni.

In building a fort here, Darius seems to have been actuated by political reasons, for Opian was a great meeting-place of three different routes:

1. The north-east road, by the Panjshir valley, and over the Khawak Pass to Anderab.
2. The west road, by the Kushan valley, and over the Hindukush Pass to Ghori.
3. The south-west road, up the Ghorband valley, and over the Hajiyak Pass to Bamiyan.

In the fourth century, Alexander founded at this spot Alexandria-under-the-Caucasus, which became a strong Greek colony.

The Susa inscriptions state that Darius built a magnificent palace at Susa, for the construction of which teak was brought from Gandhāra and ivory from Hidu.

The inscription on the tomb of Darius at Naqsh-i-Rustam must have been executed approximately about the time of his death in BC 486-5. Among its sculptures we find the representation of three nations, that have been called Indian, corresponding to the three Indian districts of the Achaemenid empire. Herzfeld gives the following description of them : 'All the three are identical ; they are naked but for a loin cloth and a sort of turban on their heads, and their weapon is a long, broad sword hanging by a strap from the shoulder.' In this connection, we may note that Herodotus, while speaking of the Indians, states that they 'wear a garment made of rushes, which, when they have cut the reed from the river and beaten it, they afterward plant like a mat and wear it like a corselet.'

Darius was always on the guard lest there should be any, what the Indian political thinkers call, *mātsya-nyāya* in his empire. Thus he says in his Susa inscriptions : 'This I did by the will of Ahura Mazda so that one does not smite another, until in (my) domain there is everybody (who) is afraid of that law which (is) mine, so that the stronger does neither smite nor oppress the weak.'

It is difficult to decide what was the limit of the Indian empire of Darius or whether Darius had any actual connection with the Indian interior. An interesting passage occurs in the *Apocryphal*, the Greek version of the *Book of Ezra*, giving an account of Darius, and it runs as follows: 'Now, the king made a great feast unto all his subjects, and unto all that were born in his house, and unto all the princes of Media and Persia, to all the satraps, captains and governors that were under him from India to Ethiopia in the hundred and twenty-seven provinces and *also to the Indian embassy from the Magadhan king*.'[1] If there is any historical truth in the account, it will be interesting to determine who was the Magadhan contemporary of Darius entering into diplomatic relationship with the latter. But in the present state of our knowledge this seems to be an impossible task.

[1] *Jewish Antiquities*, XI, 3.2. (33).

CHAPTER 3

The Successors of Darius

IN 485 BC, Darius was succeeded by his son Xerexes, an inscription of whom was discovered at Persepolis in June, 1935. 'The inscription covers four stone tablets, two containing the old Persian version in duplicate, one the Babylonian and the other the Elamite version'. In it Xerexes gives the names of the countries under his rule. The list includes the three Indian provinces, Gandhāra, Śatagu and 'Hidu'. Thus Xerexes rightly boasts of in another Persepolis record: 'What was done by my father that I protected and other did (I) further.'

Classical authors inform us that in the contingents which Xerexes led against the Greeks, in the field of Marathon and Thermopaele, the Indians fought side by side with the Iranians.

It is generally believed that the tribute list, as preserved in the account of Herodotus (III, 89-95) is clearly from his own time, that of Artaxerexes I (465-425 BC), not, as he states, from that of Darius.[1] In it we find a fresh list of the Indian districts. The Sattagydae, Gandarii, Dadicae and Aparytae paid together one hundred and seventy talents and formed the seventh province, while 'India' or Hidu formed the twentieth satrapy and paid a tribute of 360 talents. Dadicae and Aparytae are not mentioned in the epigraphs of either Darius or Xerexes, and hence they may either be regarded as fresh conquests by Artaxerexes I, or that in his time a reorganisation of the satrapies took place.

The Dadicae are generally identified with the Dards who are well-known in the Sanskrit works under the name of Darada.

[1] Debevoise, *A Political History of Parthia*, p. C. Olmstead, *l.c.*, p. 291 ff.

Ptolemy also mentions them: 'Below those of the Indus are the Daradrai, in whose country the mountains are of surpassing height'. The Aparytae are otherwise unknown, but Holdich identifies them with the modern Afridi.

The Kaspioi, who, according to Herodotus (III, 93), constituted together with the Sakai the fifteenth division of the empire, are mentioned again in VII. 67a, 86, among the eastern tribes of the army under Xerexes. It can hardly be identified with Kashmir, as proposed by some scholars, for in that case they would have the mountains between them and the Sakai, a fact which makes it improbable that the two would be grouped under the same satrapy. The term has been emended by Dr. F.W. Thomas into Kapisai, 'the Kāpisakāni of the Achaemenian records', which seems to be more probable.

The South Tomb at Persepolis is usually assigned to Artaxerexes II (404-395 BC) on artistic grounds. Here is an inscription: 'The inscription is found above the heads of the figures supporting the throne of the great king, exactly as in the tomb-inscription of Darius the great, but in a far better state of preservation'.[1] Three of these figures bear above them the following epigraphs : *iyam Qataguvia* (this is a *Sattygidian*); *iyam Ga(n)dariya* (this is a Gandhārian) ; *iyam Hi(n)duviya* (this is a Hi(n)du). Thus Artaxerexes II maintained intact the Indian empire created by the genius of Darius and his predecessors.

The problem before us now is how we shall interpret the above evidences. Shall we reject them outright and conclude that there was no Achaemenid domination over India after Darius ? This will mean the rejection of the evidence furnished by the inscription of Xerexes[2] and interpreting the Classical account regarding the army of the Iranian monarch employed against the Greeks to denote that they were mercenary soldiers from India. We doubt whether we can really go so far. Olmstead maintains that 'the Gandarians...make their last appearance as Persian tribute paying subjects in the lists of

[1] *JRAS*, 1932, p. 373.

[2] Sen, *Old Persian Inscriptions*, p. 151.

Artaxerexes, though the land continued to be known under the name of Gandhāra down to classic Indian times. The Indians of Hindush nevertheless remained loyal to the reign of the last Darius, who recognized their loyalty and their fighting ability by placing them next to the Thousand Immortals who guarded his person. There was enough contact with the West almost to the end of the fifth century for Herodotus to be able to declare that in number the Indians were far greater than all the other peoples known to the Greeks, that they paid their Persian lords the heaviest tribute (360 talents of gold dust), that Indian dogs were used in the Persian army, and that in his day four Babylonian villages were set aside for their support.'[1]

The above observations would show that at least up to the time of Artaxerexes II the Indian empire of the Achaemenids remained intact and if the Hindush really remained loyal to the last Darius, it is to be presumed that the Indians who fought against Alexander taking the side of their Iranian lord were not really mercenary soldiers as thought by some scholars. In any case, though there is scope for difference of opinions on this point, we find no reason for rejecting the epigraphic evidences of the reign of Artaxerxes II. Marshall observes that it is not known for certain how long the Achaemenids retained possession of their Indian territories. In any case, 'it is significant, however, that the historians of Alexander make no mention of any Persian officials south of the Hindu Kush; nor is there anything in their accounts of the Indus valley, Gandhāra and Taxila to imply that those areas were at that time other than completely independent. From this it seems fairly safe to conclude that the Achaemenids must have lost control of their Indian possessions some time previously—probably during the reign of Artaxerexes II—and that the Indians who fought at Arbela had been recruited as mercenaries rather than as official levies.'[2]

It is not unlikely that after Artaxerexes II 'the satraps took command of the local armies in addition to other duties, and

[1] Olmstead, *l.c.*, p. 292.
[2] *Taxila*, I, pp. 16-17.

became increasingly powerful, with the result that by the first half of the fourth century BC. large parts of the empire were asserting their independence. It was in this period that Taxila and other Indian provinces appeared to have thrown off the Achaemenid yoke.'[1] The process, however, seems to have been a gradual one and like Shah Alam II, the Mughal emperor of Delhi, the Achaemenid monarch was still recognised as the *de jure*, if not *de facto* overlord. The South Tomb inscription of Persepolis, mentioning the nationality of the various subjects of the empire, was thus more of the nature of a document of consolation for Artaxerexes II.

Much emphasis has been laid on the fact that the Indian soldiers in the Persian army that fought on the soil of Greece were led by satraps of other provinces, not of India. Indeed the Persian Army Roster shows that the Gandarians and Dadicae were placed under Artyphius, son of Artabanus, and the Bactrians and the Amyrgian Sacae under the king's brother, Hystaspes, son of Darius and Atossa. A comparison of the Roster with the lists of Darius indicates certain administrative changes. Thus the Gandarians, Dadicae, Aparytae and the Sattagydians, which constituted two satrapies, were united together. It is not strange that in the army units while the Indians usually formed the cavalry, their nobles had not abandoned the old Aryan custom of fighting from the chariots drawn by horses or wild asses.[2] Though generally the armies were put under their respective Satraps, we lack detailed accounts which is responsible for deviations here and there. In any case, the Persian Army Roster of Xerexes should be taken in the background of his inscriptions.

When Alexander the great invaded the Achaemenid empire in *c.* 330 BC, the Indians fought on the side of Darius III (336-330 BC) at the field of Arbela. Arrian points out that in the contingents sent from India, there were : (a) the '*Indians*' under the command of Bessus, the 'Viceroy of Bactria' ; (b) the '*mountaineer Indians*' under the command of Bassaentes, the 'Viceroy of Arachosia' ; and (c) a few elephants, '*belonging to*

[1] *Ibid*, p. 14.
[2] Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, p. 246.

the Indians who live this side of the Indus.'[1]

We have already seen that for the purpose of building his palace, Darius the great acquired ivory from Hidu. Hidu country thus had enormous of elephants. Therefore, the Indians of Arrian's (c) may have been the inhabitants of the Hidu country, part of which was on 'this side of the Indus.'

Pāṇini in his Aṣṭādhyāyī states two very important rules: "The affix *ca* comes after a word denoting mountain, in the sense of '*this is his motherland*', when it is a person who lives by arms" ; (ii) 'To a name expressing a multitude living by the trade of arms, is added the affix *ñyat*, when it is the name among the Vāhika (the land of five rivers), but not when it is the name of *Brāhmaṇa*, nor when the word is *rājanya.*' From these two rules it is evident that there were '*mountaineer Indians*' living in the Punjab, who followed the profession of arms and they evidently fought as mercenary troops on the side of the Persian king.

[1] *CHI*, I, p. 341. *PHAI*, p. 196.

CHAPTER 4

The Achaemenid Administration

We do not know exactly the system followed by the Achaemenid monarchs in the administration of their Indian domain. As we have already seen, according to Herodotus it was divided into two satrapies, one comprising Gandhāra and Śatagu, and the other comprising India or Hidu. This system of government by satraps seems to have been prevalent throughout the Achaemenid period. The satraps, though undoubtedly subordinate to the Great Kings, had the power of issuing money on their own accounts, for we have from Rawalpindi a gold coin (daric) of an unknown satrap of the Persian (Achaemenid) empire, though it is difficult to decide whether it was brought there from outside.[1] Rapson thinks that during the period of the Achaemenid rule... Persian coins circulated in the Punjab. Gold double staters... were actually struck in India, probably in the latter half of the 4th century BC. Many of the silver sigloi, moreover, bear countermarks so similar to the native punchmarks as to make it seem probable that the two classes of coins were in circulation together......, and this probability is increased by the occurrence of characters which have been read as Brāhmī and Kharoṣṭhī letters.'[2] Dr. Macdonald, however, holds that the gold darics were never in circulation in India on the ground that the value of gold relatively to silver was much lower in India than in Persia and that very few darics have yet been discovered in India.[3]

[1] *ASIR*, 1926-7, p. 212.
[2] Rapson, *Indian Coins*, p. 3.
[3] *CHI*, I, p. 343.

The Great Kings, however, kept watchful eyes in all the matters of the state and often interfered in the religious affairs of their subjects. Thus, after giving a list of the subject countries, Xerexes states in his Persepolis inscriptions: 'And within these countries was (another) where formerly Daivas were worshipped. Afterwards by the will of Ahura Mazda, I destroyed the place of Daiva (worship). And I proclaimed: Daivas thou shall not worship. Where formerly Daivas were worshipped there I worshipped Ahura Mazda and the divine fulfilments.' The references to Daivas or Devas seem to point out that the religious revolution took place in some part of the Indian districts of the Achaemenid empire.

One interesting fact we should note in this connection. When Alexander crossed the Hindukush, he met no Persian officials east of the mountain which supports the theory that the Indian provinces were finally lost to the Achaemenids in the reign of Artaxerexes II. The Persians seem to have left the native states on the Indian borderland and the Punjab to retain their autonomy evidently on the condition of payment of tribute, and the satraps represented the imperial personage on the Indian soil. So long as these Indian chiefs obeyed their suzerain, there was no necessity of Persian officials, and the offices of the satraps were worked evidently by the Indian staffs. Bühler has pointed out this state of affairs long ago, and it was to this Indo-Persian intercourse that he ascribed the birth of the new script of Kharoṣṭhī.

From the account of the Classical authors, it appears that there were nearly twenty-eight such states on the Indo-Achaemenid soil on the eve of Alexander's invasion—some of them being republics and some monarchical.[1] An Indian writer of the Achaemenid age condemns the Uttarāpath as the land of the Āraṭṭas or arāṣṭras *i.e.*, kingless states or republics.[2] In a later age, the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea* speaks of the Āraṭṭi along with Arachosii, Gandarii and Poclais as the regions lying above Indo-Scythia. At the time of Alexander's invasion there were, however, both monarchical and republican

[1] For an account of these states, see *PHAI*, pp. 196-209.

[2] *Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra*, I,2,14.

states in the Punjab, NWFP and the Sind, and most of them, specially the republicans, offered stiff resistance to the Macedonian hero.

A question has often been raised whether the Paropamisadai region should be included within the boundary of the Indo-Achaemenid empire or Iran proper. Geographically, no doubt, it should go to India, but culturally it belonged to Iran. The Kharoṣṭhī, it has been assumed, is the direct result of the Persian rule in India, but a look at the excellent map of the find-spots of the Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions in *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, Vol. II, p. xiv, will show that no Kharoṣṭhī record has ever been found westward of the Panjkora river, a fact which *prima facie* may indicate that it was outside the official jurisdiction of the Achaemenid satraps of India. Indian culture, however, penetrated into the region in the later days, for when, in the seventh century the Chinese traveller Yuan Chwang visited Kāpiśā he found it thoroughly Indian under a king who belonged to the Kṣatriya caste.

Another country that has similarly been connected with the Achaemenid India is Makran, the barren region lying along the coast of Baluchistan. It has been identified with Make mentioned in Column I of the Behistun inscription and hence we can infer that it was conquered either by Cyrus or Cambyses. Herodotus mentions it (Myci), along with Sagartii, Sarangeii Thamanaei, Utti and the dwellers on islands as forming the fourteenth province of the Achaemenid empire. The grouping plainly shows that it was not Indian, but belonged to Iran. 'The people show no trace of Indian culture, and are as rugged as the land in which they dwell'. The river Hingol seems to have been the farthest limit of Indian cultural zone in Baluchistan in the west, where in the later days we find one of the sacred Tantric *pīṭhas* of India.

CHAPTER 5

Tribal Immigrations in the Achaemenid Age

INTRODUCTORY

UNDER the Achaemenids, the North-Western India and the Punjab became a part of the 'Empire' which included most of the Western Asia and a considerable portion of the Central Asian tablelands as well. In the Hamadan inscription, Darius the great thus speaks of the limits of his empire : 'This (is) the empire that I possess ; from the Śaka who are beyond Sugd as far as the Kush, from the Hindu as far as Sparda, which Ahura Mazda has granted unto me.' This limit was further extended in the later days by the conquest of a part of the Balkan Peninsula and the European Scyths, and thus the Achaemenid-empire became a conglomeration of different races well-knit together by the common imperial bond. India constituted the richest satrapy of this empire, as Herodotus would make us believe, and naturally attracted nomads from outside, living in the barren and unfruitful tracts. Toynbee has pointed out that at a cycle of 600 years the steppes of Eurasia see alternately the increase and decrease of humidity and aridity of the climate, and the consequent periodic increase in the fertility of the soil attracts denser population, and the subsequent decrease of fertility and the consequent shortage of food supply drive the nomads in search of new homes (*A Study of History*, Vol. III, pp. 395 ff.). But it is difficult to determine whether this process was at work in cases of the tribal immigrations into India in the days of the Achaemenids.

THE ŚAKAS

J. Przyluski has tried to show that there had been Śaka infiltrations in India prior to the days of Alexander and the name

Śākala is associated with these foreigners.[1] They were a branch of the vast Scythian horde that inhabited Central Asia at the dawn of history.[2] The tribes inhabiting this and the adjoining regions were first known to the Chinese through the reports of Chang-k'ien, which are incorporated in Ch. 123 of *Shi-ki* of T'si-ma t'sien, the Herodotus of China.[3] According to this information, 'the people occupying the tracts from Ta-yuan (Ferghana) westwards as far as the country of An-si (Parthia) talked different dialects, but their manners and customs being in the main identical, they understood each other. They had deep-set eyes, most of them wore beards.......' A later authority states that they, excepting the inhabitants of Yu-tien, had high noses, while the commentary on the *Shi-ki*, 123, 4, states that the Yueh-chi, a tribe of this region, were pink and white in complexion.[4] The description seems to convey the idea that the population belonged to the Indo-European group, and as the people understood each other, the various dialects of this region apparently originated from a common stock.[5]

The Behistun, Persepolis and the Hamadan inscriptions speak of the Śakas as included within the empire of Darius. The Hamadan inscription fixes the habitat of this tribe beyond Sugd or Sogdiana (*para-Sugdam*) i.e., in the valley of the Syr-Daria or Jaxartes, in and around Ferghana. This is exactly the place where Strabo also locates them : 'The Sacae and the Sogdiani are separated from one another by the Jaxartes river, and the Sogdiani and Bactrians by the Oxus river.'[6]

[1] *Un Ancien Peuple du Penjab* : *Les Udumbaras* in *JA*, 1926, p. 13. *cf. JA*, 1929.

[2] Central Asia properly speaking includes the regions now known as Russian Turkistan and Chinese Turkistan with the adjoining areas. South Russia is but an annex of Central Asia.

[3] This chapter has been translated by F. Hirth in *JAOS*, 1917, pp. 89 ff.

[4] McGovern, *The Early Empires of Central Asia*, pp. 473 ff.

[5] Thomas thinks that the original language of this region was a form of Proto-Tibetan, *Asia Major*, Vol. II, 1925, pp. 251 ff. *cf* Pelliot, *Memories de la Societe Linguistique*, 1913, pp. 89 ff. Scholars now generally think that the Śakas belonged to the Indo-European stock, and spoke a branch of the Iranian tongue, *JRAS*, 1920, p. 156. *IHQ*. Vol. II, p. 193. Haddon, *Races of Man*, p. 112.

[6] Strabo, XI. 8 2.

The Naqsh-i-Rustam inscription of Darius, 'which reflects the changes in the extent of his empire and in the organisation of its administration', divides the 'Śaka' people into three different groups, distinguished by appositions, *viz*. (1) the Śaka *tigrakhaudā*, (2) the Śaka *haumavarkā* and (3) the Śaka *taradrāya*. Amongst these, the Śaka *taradrāya*, the Śaka beyond the sea, evidently the Caspian, refers to the European Scyths, and not to the Śaka tribe proper, for the Persians called 'all the Scythians Sacae.'

The Śaka *tigrakhaudā*, 'the Śakas with pointed caps,' and the Śaka *haumavarkā*, 'the Śakas who are the preparers of Soma,' the Amyrgian Śakas, have been regarded by Herodotus as the one and the same people. 'The Sacae' says Herodotus, 'who are Scythians, had on their heads caps, which came to a point and stood erect; they also wore loose trousers, and carried bows peculiar to their country, and daggers, and also battle axes, called *sagares*. These though they are Amyrgian Scythians, they called Sacae, for the Persians call the Scythians Sacae.' Several modern scholars also follow the same view and regard the two as identical.

Before dealing with this question further, we may for a moment look at the dress of the figures of the Śaka prisoners on the tomb of Darius. They wear "a long over-coat, cut exactly like a modern morning dress, lined with fur, long and rather wide trousers with coverings for the feet made of the same piece of stuff, and a cap, with protecting ear and cheek pieces, extremely pointed in the case of the '*European*' and '*tigrakhaudā* Śaka,' much less in case of the '*haumavarkā*.'" The wearing of the pointed caps was thus a fashion with all Śaka and the kindred tribes.

So when the Naqsh-i-Rustam inscription speaks of the Śaka '*tigrakhaudā*', 'those who used pointed caps,' we may take them as meaning the Śakas in general, or rather the Śakas settled in the empire of Darius, including the '*haumavarkā*' and the '*taradrāya*', although they using the same head-dress were different in other respects.

In Indian Literature, the Śakas are closely connected with the Magas or the Magi.

Prof. Moulton points out that the Magi introduced in ancient Persia the custom of marriage between the closest kin, a religious duty of the most extravagant sanctity.[1] We find this custom also in South India. The earliest reference to it as a South Indian custom is to be found in the *Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra*, which Keith assigns to the second or third century BC.[2] But the work seems to be pre-Aśokan in view of the fact that in it Kaliṅga is branded as a very impure country (*padbhyāṃ sa kurute pāpaṃ ya Kaliṅgān prapadyate*) which shows that in the days of the *Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra* the Brāhmaṇical culture had not penetrated into that place. But from the Thirteenth Rock Edict of Aśoka we learn that in Kaliṅga 'there dwell Brāhmaṇic, Śramanic and other sects and householders, among whom are established this hearkening to the elders, hearkening to the parents, hearkening to the preceptors, seemly behaviour and steadfast devotion to friends, acquaintances, companions and relatives and to slaves and servants'. This suggests that the Brāhmaṇical culture became prominent in Kaliṅga some time before the days of Aśoka, and hence the *Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra* is to be regarded as pre-Aśokan.

Thus the custom of marriage between the closest kin came into vogue in South India sometime before the third century BC, the age of Aśoka. It is, of course, not clear whether the custom was indigenous or of foreign origin. If it had been introduced by the Maga Brāhmaṇas,[3] then the Śakas may have come to India in a pre-Aśokan age, and in that case we may take the example cited by Patañjali as referring to the Śakas

1 Moultan, *Early Religious Poetry of Persia*, pp. 75-77.

Keith, *History of Classical Sanskrit Literature*, p. 438.

3 The Purāṇas and the Great Epic inform us that the Brāhmaṇas of the Śākakadvīpa or the Śaka country were called Magas (*Kūrma Purāṇa*, XVIII, 36. *Mbh*, VI. 2). Ptolemy in his *Geography* speaks of a settlement of the Maga Brāhmaṇas in South India :

'In like manner the parts under Mount Bettigo are occupied by the Brakhmanoi Magoi as far as the Batai with this city, Brakhme...128 19'.

The 'Mount Bettigo' is identical with the Tamil Podegai, Sk. Malaya, ranges in the Pāṇḍya kingdom. Herodotus (I.101) states that the Magi or Magas were one of the six tribes of the Medes. In the Indian literature, however, as they are described as the Brāhmaṇas of the Śaka land, they seem to have migrated to India in the train of the Śakas and performed the priestly functions of the tribe.

in India,[1] and not of Central Asia, as considered by de la Vallee Poussin.

Varāhamihira in his *Bṛhatsaṃhitā* tells us that the installation and consecration of the images and temples of the Sun should be caused to be made by the Magas,[2] who were regarded as the Brāhmaṇas of the Śaka community. According to the *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa*, Śāmba, the son of Kṛṣṇa, by Jāmbavatī. constructed a temple of the Sun on the river Candrabhāgā and appointed Maga priests for the purpose of the daily worship of the god.[3] It thus appears that the Maga Śakas introduced a new form of Sun-worship in India. The statement of the Purāṇas, '*Śākadvīpe tu vai Viṣṇuḥ Sūrya-rūpadharo mune,*' seems also to point to the Śaka influence on the Sun-cult of India.

Sir R. G. Bhandarkar says that in the accounts of the Saura system there is not the remotest allusion to a temple of the Sun.[4] It appears, therefore, that if we find any reference to a Sun-temple we may presume it as an instance of Śaka influence. Now, we learn from Philostratos that there was a temple of the Sun at Taxila, and from Plutarch that there was another on the Hydaspes, to which the elephants of Porus ascended on the advance of Alexander.[5] If we may believe that the Magas came to India in the trains of the Śakas, then this would prove that the Śakas entered India before the advent of Alexander in this country.

THE YAVANAS

In a series of articles in *JA*, 1926-29, J. Przyluski has dealt

[1] Patañjali in his *Mahābhāṣya* (c. 150 BC) while commenting on the sūtra of Pāṇini '*Śūdrānāmaniravasitānām*' states incidentaly that the Śakas are not untouchables and they need not be '*expelled from the dish*', and further that they are living outside the Āryāvarta which is defined as the region to the east of Adarśa or Adarśana, i.e., the place where the river Sarasvatī disappears in the sand, the present Hissar in Haryana ; to the west of Kālakavana, usually identified with a wild tract near Allahabad, to the south of the Himalayas ; and to the north of the Pāriyātra, i.e., the western part of the present Vindhya range.

[2] *Bṛhat Saṃhitā*, IV. 19.

[3] *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa*, ch. 139.

[4] R. G. Bhandarkar, *Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism and Minor Religious Systems*, p. 221.

[5] Cunningham, *Coins of the Śakas*, p. 22ff.

with the tribes *e.g.* Udumbaras and others, that possibly migrated to India prior to the days of Alexander's invasion. But the greatest historical proof of the settlement of a foreign tribe on the Indian soil in such an early age, it is commonly supposed, is furnished by a rule in the Grammar of Pāṇini, IV. I. 49., which states *inter alia* that a feminine form of Yavana is *Yavanānī*. According to Kātyāyana, *Yavanānī* denotes *Yavanāllipyāṃ*, paraphrased by Patañjali (*Mahābhāṣya*, ed. Kielhorn, II, p. 220) : *Yavanāllipyāṃ iti vaktavyam, Yavanānī lipiḥ.*

The denotation of the term Yavana is a moot question, though the general tendency of the scholars is to take it as referring to the Ionian Grecians. Pāṇini certainly lived in the pre-Alexandrian period, possibly in the fifth century BC., and hence the question naturally arises, what was the ultimate source of Pāṇini's knowledge of the Ionians or the Grecians ? Two alternatives are possible : (a) that the Ionians had already established a colony in India at the time of Pāṇini, or (b) that Pāṇini got the knowledge of the Ionians through the Persians.

A Yona state is mentioned along with Kamboja in the *Majjhima Nikāya* (II. 149) as flourishing in the time of Gautama Buddha and Assalāyana. The historians of Alexander's invasion speak of the Greek state of Nysa, and Arrian says that the Nysians were not an Indian race, but descended from the men who came into India with Dionysios. Thus the Nysians seem to have been Thracians and not Ionians. Bhandarkar thinks that, Sophytes. who ruled a district on the bank of the Akesines and who speedily submitted to Alexander was a Greek prince with an Indian name, though this view has not generally been accepted by the historians. It thus appears to be beyond any doubt that the Greeks had settled in India long before the days of Alexander's invasion.

Now, had Pāṇini referred to these Grecians of India, the proper term to be used by him would have been Yona (cf. *Majjhima Nikāya*), and not Yavana. The inscriptions of the Achaemenid monarch Darius also vouchsafe it. Here the old Persian form of the Ionian name is Iauna, while the Elamite has Ia-u-na, and the Babylonian form is Matu in-ma-nu, and Matu in-a ma-nu. Weissbach points out that in the Babylonian

form *m* stands for *n*, 'according to a peculiar sound-law, or perhaps rather an orthographical rule.

Lévi has pointed out that the 'Yavana' is the Sanskrit form while the Prakrit form is Yona. But the use of the 'Yona' or 'Yauna' in the *Mahābhārata*, seems to weaken the theory.[1] Prof. Horwitz, in his *Indian Theatre*, derives the term Yavana as '*Yavena gacchatīti Yavana*' and takes the term as referring to those who used a quick mode of conveyance—the Persians, who came on horse-backs and the Grecians and laterly the Romans and the Arabs, who came in sailing ships. He holds, therefore, 'that the term Yavana need not necessarily refer to the Grecians, who never called themselves as Ionians, with which alone can the term Yavana be equated', and hence concludes 'that because there is the term Yavanikā in the Sanskrit dramas, Indian dramaturgy need not be assumed to be post-Grecian in origin.' Prof. E. J. Thomas also came to the conclusion that the term Yavana denoted not only the Greeks, but the Persians as well.

Thus we have two terms in the Indian literature, Yauna and Yavana, that require serious considerations. The term Yauna is undoubtedly derived from 'Iauna', the Ionians, but the exact stem of the term Yavana is uncertain. It has been pointed out that the term Yawan or Javan is of Hebrew origin and was 'originally the collective designation of the Ionians of Asia Minor.'[2] From a very early period the Indians maintained commercial relationship with the Babylonians, and it is thus not improbable, it may appear, that 'the word came to the Hindus from the Babylonians probably during the Persian rule, but possibly earlier. It was thus in its origin a mere transfer of current Semetic usage.'

It has been suggested that 'Pāṇini of Gandhāra obtained his knowledge about the true Yavanas from the Ionians of Sogdiana.' But since the *Majjhima Nikāya* speaks of a Yona state on the Indian borderland at the time of the Buddha, we may presume that Pāṇini, if he had any knowledge of the Ionians or the Greeks, derived it from the Greeks of India itself. But what

[1] *Mbh*. XII. 207.43.

[2] *JAOS*, 1904, pp. 302f.

does the great grammarian mean by the expression 'the writing of the Yavanas.' ? We have no evidence of Greek script in India before the days of Alexander the great. It is, however, quite possible that the Greek traders of Pāṇini's age used in India the Aramaic script, the official script of the Achaemenid empire, and Pāṇini may have referred to it as the writings of the Yavanas. And the use of Aramaic in India is proved by a Taxila inscription discovered by Sir John Marshall.

Dr. Tarn discusses at length the significance of the term *Yonaka* and distinguishes it from Yona. We may, however, compare *Yonaka* with terms like *Madraka, Kośalaka* etc. The word is, no doubt, derived from the term Yona with the suffix *ka* in the sense of *'this is his motherland'*, and it is hardly

[3] O. Stein's view that the term Yavana does not always mean Greek is hardly tenable. For his views See *Indian Culture*, I, pp. 343ff. Shafer has discussed lat ength about the Yavanas in India and in that connection noted the problem of the date of Pāṇini in the following words. "The weakness of this Indian theory (which maintains that there was a Greek colony in India about 550 BC.) would seem to be that western scholars have generally accepted a later date for Pāṇini than the fifth century BC. I have impression that British scholars have generally accepted *ca*. 400 BC., and German scholars *ca*. 350 BC. These dates are sometimes given with great assurance and no authority. But where an authority is cited, it always seems to be Bohtlingk. The Kathāsaritsāgara (beginning of 12th cent.) mentions Pāṇini as a pupil of Varṣa and Varṣa as living under the rule of king Nanda. father of Candragupta ; and from this Bohtlings deduced' Dak Panini im 4. Jahrhundert gelebt hat, ist, wie wir spater sehen werden, nicht ganz unwahrscheinlich'. Bohtlingk suggested this date with more reserves than even the above citation suggests. But if we take the dates *ca* 400 BC. or 350 BC., which have been accepted by western scholars upon so insecure a basis, still it is rather surprising to find Panini making rules for the formation of the feminine of Yavana if the Yavanas only came to India with Alexander in 326 BC., for Bohttlingk himself thought Yavanas must have been known to India for some time for Pāṇini to make rules about their name. To allow for that we should have to date the great grammarian's work at least as late as 300 BC., and we should have to assume that he, Kātyāyana. and Patañjali were hastily recording a dying language, since Aśoka erected his pillar and rock edicts about 250 BC. in the local prakrits, If we cannot definitely date Pāṇini's life at present, we have at least seen that if we do not accept the early dating of Indian scholars, we still have difficulties with 'accepted' western dating and problems if we date the grammarian after Alexander." *Ethnography of Ancient India*, pp. 27-8.

necessary to connect it with Yung-kin of Wen-chung as Dr. Tarn has done.

OTHER TRIBES

In a very interesting article in *JA*, 1926, pp, 1 ff., J.Przyluski has dealt with the tribes that entered India shortly before the Persian rule. These foreign peoples settled mostly in the North-Western Frontier Province and the Punjab and the Indian writers classed all these barbarians together as Bāhlikas, a term which in a narrow sense meant the Bhallas, west of the Jhelum.[1] To the east of that river such new immigrants were the Madras, a people between the Chenub and the Ravi, and the Sauvīra-Sindhus, who later on moved southwards and founded a new capital at Roruka or Alor. Alexander's historians speak of the hill-ruler Arsaces and of the Sogdioi on the Indus. The name Arsaces is Parthian or North-Iranian while Sogdioi is evidently derived from Sogdiana in Central Asia. There is, however, no proof that the names are pre-Achaemenid, and it is rather possible to find traces in them of India's contact with the region beyond the Himalayas at an age when under the Achaemenids both formed parts of the same empire.

[1] J. Przyluski, *JA*, 1926, p. 11. de la Vallee Poussin, *L'Inde aux temps des Mauryas et des Barbares*, pp. 13-14.

Foreign Notices of India in the Achaemenid Age

THE Persian conquest of India unlocked to the Greeks a new world with a new people which is reflected in Greek literature from the sixth century BC. By the middle of the fifth century, Herodotus, whom Cicero dubbed as the Father of History, was able to offer considerable information about that distant land. Herodotus was born at Halicarnassus in Asia Minor, then dependent upon the Persians, about the year 484 BC. He was thus born a Persian subject and was interested in the affairs of Persia and Egypt. He compiled a history of the Achaemenids and of the Scythians, but as Keane has observed 'his knowledge of India was meagre and most vague. He knew that it was one of the remotest provinces of the Persian empire towards the east, but of its extent and exact position he had no proper conception.'[1] An analysis of his account shows that his knowledge of India was derived from the following sources :

I. The information that he was able to collect for himself in course of his travel.
II. The information supplied to him by the Persians.[2]
III. The work left by Scylax of Caryanda.[3]
IV. The narrative of Hecataeus of Miletus.[4]

[1] Keane, *Evolution of Geography*, pp. 5-6. The work of Herodotus has been translated into English and other languages : see the English translation of AD. Godley, Herodotus, in Loeb Classical Library, 4 vols.

[2] Herodotus explicitly refers to the Persians while giving his account of gold-digging ants.

[3] Herodotus, IV. 44.

[4] *Ibid*, V. 36.125 ; VI. 137.

Herodotus was a great traveller and his travelling seems, to have been chiefly accomplished between his twentieth and thirty-seventh years, though the dates are difficult to be determined. He visited the Persian capital Susa and advanced as far as the land of the Scythians in Central Asia. 'At the most moderate estimate his travels covered a space of 31 degrees of longitude, or 1,700 miles, and 24 of latitude or nearly the same distance.' We may presume that in course of his travels, Herodotus may have heard of the Indians, but we do not know exactly whether he did see the Achaemenid epigraphs. Macan thinks that 'the Achaemenid records which have within living memory greatly modified our knowledge of the rise and progress of the Persian power were inaccessible to Herodotus, but his account of that Empire and its organisation must go back, at second or third hand, to such documents and written records.'[1]

The documents and written records of the Persians throwing light on the then India may be divided into two groups, the Persian inrcriptions and the *Avesta*. The references to India, in the Achaemenid epigraphs have already been noted and it is clear from them that they show nowhere any knowledge of the interior of India. This closely agrees with the account of India as preserved in the *Avesta*. The date of the *Avesta* is a moot question among the scholars, but there is unanimity on the point that the Vendidad is the earliest part of the work and may have been pre-Achaemenid. In the first chapter of the *Vendidad* (I. 19), we find a list of the '*sixteen countries*' said to have been created by Ahura Mazda. One of the sixteen names is Hapta Hindu, or Sapta Sindhu as occurring in the *Ṛgveda*.[2] Once in that Indian work the term

[1] *Cambridge Ancient History*, V, p. 416.

[2] As Jackson states: "The fifteenth of these dominions, according to vol. I, 18, was Hapta Hindu, 'Seven Rivers', a region of 'abnormal heat', probably idential with the territory of Sapta Sindhavas, 'Seven Rivers', in the Veda (see especially *RV*. VIII, 24, 27). The district in question, which was more comprehensive than the modern Punjab, or 'Five Rivers', must have included the lands watered in the north and north-west of Hindustan by the river Indus and its affluents—answering, apparently, to the Vedic Vitastā (now Jhelum), Asiknī (Chenub), Parushnī (later named Irāvatī,

is used to denote a particular country, elsewhere the expression refers to the seven rivers themselves. Max Muller thinks that the expression 'Sapta-Sindhu' refers to the five streams of the Punjab, with the Indus and the Sarasvatī, while Ludwig, Lassen and Whitney hold that the Kubhā should be substituted for the last named river.[1] We prefer the latter interpretation, for the Kubhā (the Kabul river) must have been better known to the Iranians than the far off Sarasvatī of the Ambala region, while, on the other hand, the Khoaspes, a tributary of the Kabul, is actually mentioned in the *Avesta*. The later Pahlavi commentators of the *Avesta* of the Sassanid age interpreted the term Hapta-Hindu in a different manner. They stated that the country was called Hapta-Hindu, because there were seven rulers over it. It is possible that there were seven rulers over the land of the Indus at the time that intervened between the fall of the Imperial Kuṣāṇas and the rise of the Guptas.

The statement of the *Vendidad* that Hapta-Hindu was one of the countries created by the great Ahura Mazda seems to point to the fact (a) that the religion of Ahura Mazda prevailed at least in some portion of the country, and (b) that the people of the region, or at least a section of it, had Iranian blood in them. This reminds us of the statement of Xerxes in his Persepolis epigraph that he suppressed the worship of the Daivas and introduced that of Ahura Mazda in its place, while traces of the Iranian blood in the people of the Indo-Iranian borderland is admitted by all the anthropologists.

References to places etc. of the Indian borderland occurring in the *Avesta* have been fully discussed by Sir A. Stein in a paper in the *Academy*, May, 16, 1885. These interesting references are found mainly in the Pahlavi gloss of the Sassanid times, and hence fall outside the period with which we are dealing. It may be noted, however, that in the *Meher Yasht* (104) and *Yasna* (LVII.29), we find the word Hindu instead of Hapta-Hindu—a fact which shows that laterly, the name Hindu

Whence its present designation Rāvi), Vipāś (Beās), and Sutudrī (Sutlej), the latter being its easternmost stream." (*CHI*, I, pp. 289-90).

[1] *Vedic Index*, II, s.v. Sapta-S ndhu.

or India was not confined to the country watered by the Indus, but was extended to the region other than this.

Herodotus utilised for his account of the Indo-Iranian borderland the work of Scylax of Caryanda, possibly the first Greek historian to write anything about India (*c.* 515 BC). The work of Scylax is unfortunately lost, though references to it occur in the works of later writers. In his *History*, Herodotus has preserved the following account of him.

'A great part of Asia was explored under the direction of Darius. He being desirous to know in what part the Indus, which is the second river that produces crocodiles, discharges itself into the sea, sent in ships both others on whom he could rely to make a true report and also Scylax of Caryanda. They accordingly setting out from the city of Caspatyrus and the country of Pactyce, sailed down the river towards the east and sunrise to the sea ; then sailing on the sea westwards, they arrived in the thirteenth month at that place where the king of Egypt despatched the Phoenicians, whom I before mentioned, to sail round Libya. After these persons had sailed round, Darius subdued the Indians and frequented the sea.'[1]

We have already referred to this account while discussing the conquest of Hindu by Darius. Though unforutnately we do not know the contents of the work left by Scylax, it seems certain that it did not contain the account of his voyage, for we do not hear anything of it in connection with the voyage of Alexander. It possibly contained miraculous and absurd stories about the people of India, and Aristotle's reference to it, though important, is of little value for the study of ancient Indian History or Geography.

The above account of Herodotus, in any case, shows that Scylax actually came to India, and started his sailing from 'the city of Caspatyrus and the country of Pactyce.' Sir Aurel Stein identifies 'Pactyce with Caspatyrus' with north-east Afghanistan ; the Afghans still call themselves Pakhtun or Pashtuns (cf. Pathans), while Caspatyrus, according to Stein, is 'evidently'

[1] Herodotus, IV, 44.

Kabul. Thus the *janapada* of 'Pactyce with Caspatyrus' may denote the Pashtu-speaking area, which was Iranian even before Scylax undertook his voyage. According to Grierson, 'Pāshtō is spoken in British territory in the Trans-Indus districts as far as Dera Ismail Khan. Northwards it extends into the Yusufzai country, Bajaur, Swat and Bunir, and through the Indus Kohistan at least as far as the river Kandia, where the Indus takes its great turn to the south. In the northern parts of Swat, Bunir and Kohistan, many of the inhabitants speak in their home languages of Dardic origin, but Pāshtō is universal as a means of general intercommunication. In British territory, its eastern boundary may roughly be taken as coinciding with the course of the Indus .... After entering the district of Dera Ismail Khan, the eastern boundary gradually slopes away from the Indus, leaving the lower parts of the valley in possession of Landha and some thirty miles south of the town of Chandhwan it meets Balochi and turns to the west.'[1] This whole area was thus Iranian at a very early age.

Stein has accepted Herodotus' account of Scylax's voyage with some modification. He thinks that in his account Herodotus has confused the Kabul river with the Indus, and so makes the latter wrongly flow east. But it is difficult to agree with this because the Kabul river is not navigable, and further the location of Caspatyrus is not yet definitely settled. While some scholars think that 'the town may have been situated near the lower end of the Cophen (now Kabul) river before it joins the Indus,' others prefer its identification with the Western Kashmir. Herodotus' idea, that the river Indus flowed towards the east, and that beyond that corner of India which the Persians knew there was nothing but a great desert towards the east, is no doubt derived from Hecataeus of Miletus, to whom Herodotus is deeply indebted for his account of India and the Indians.

Dr. R. C. Majumdar, however, maintains that it appears from the account of Herodotus that the city of Caspatyrus in Pactyica was quite close to the lower Indus valley bordering on the desert. According to him "the city of Caspatyrus, from

[1] *Linguistic Survey of India*, I, pp. 105ff.

which Scylax started, must have therefore been on the Lower Indus, and may be located near about modern Shehwan where the Indus, which so long runs south, takes a sharp bend towards the east. It is impossible in view of the changes in the course of this river to locate the place more definitely. But there is absolutely no ground to locate it in Gandhāra or upper course of the Indus, and the last sentence in the passage quoted above from Herodotus *viz.* that after conquering the Indians he 'made use of the sea *in those parts* makes it highly probable that the Indian kingdom conquered by Darius was on the lower course of the river.''[1] Herodotus however seems to locate 'the city of Caspatyrus and the country of pactyce' northward of other Indians and states that their mode of life resembles that of the Bactrians. This seems to support indirectly the view of Sir Aurel Stein (infra).

Persian documents and the work of Scylax possibly formed the basis of the Indian account of the Geography of Hecataeus of Miletus which was composed *c.* 500 BC. Hecataeus tried to dissuade the Ionians from revolt against Persia (*Herodotus,* V. 36, 125), and in 494, when they were obliged to sue for terms, he was one of the ambassadors to the Persian satrap, whom he persuaded to restore the constitution of the Ionic cities (*Diod.* Sic X. 25). 'His *Survey of the World*' is said to have comprised the accounts of the two continents, Europe and Asia, and hence incidental references to the Indian sub-continent. Dr. Wells in the *Journal of the Hellenic Studies* (1909) XXIX, pt. I has questioned the authenticity of the work, and Herodotus also has controverted his statements (VI. 137). It has been supposed, however, that 'it was to the stimulus of this book that Herodotus owed his love of travelling and his interests in strange lands.'

The *Fragments* 174-179 in *Fragment a Historicarum* of C. Muller show that Hecataeus' knowledge of India stopped on

[1] *IHQ*, 1949, p. 160. Olmstead observes, 'To the south-east of Gandara lay the fabulous plains of India famous for the gold dust washed from its rivers. Spies were commissioned to travel from Caspapyrus of Gandarian Pactyica, the head of navigation on the Kabul affluent of the Indus, down to the mouth where it entered the Indian Ocean.' (*History of the Persian Empire*, p. 144).

the river Indus, 'beyond which was a great desert of sand,' evidently the Thar desert of Western India. He speaks of the 'Indoi', possibly identical with the Hi(n)du, of the Gandarii and Caspapyros. In fact, he calls Caspapyros a Gandaric city. Those who identify Caspapyros or Caspatyros with the Western Kashmir may point out in this connection that in the *Mahāvaṃsa* Kashmir is constantly associated with Gandhāra, while the *Jātakas* mention the countries separately as comprising two Kingdoms but ruled by a single king.

Hecataeus mentions the name of another Indian people, the Kalatiai, and a city of India called Argante. None, however, admit of proper identifications. The Greek geographer, further, states that a tribe called the Opiai 'dwell by the river Indus, and there is a royal fort. Thus far the Opiai extend, and beyond there is a desert as far as the Indians.' The tribe called the Opiai evidently lived in the region of Opian which was the capital of ancient Kāpiśa country, where there was a fort of the great King Darius, as shown by the Column III of the Behistun inscription already noted. Further, in Greek records, this is the earliest mention of the 'Indians' by name. There is also a doubtful reference to the Indians in the plays of Aeschylus.

The work of Hecataeus is lost and it survives only in the quotations of the later writers. He possessed a scepticism about the Greek traditions, and this is best expressed in the opening sentence of *Inquiries* : 'This is the story of Hecataeus of Miletus. What I write here is what I consider true ; for the tales of the Greeks appear to me to be many and ridiculous.'

Having thus given an account of the sources utilised by Herodotus for his account of India, we may now proceed to analyse its contents. Two questions arise at the outset ; (a) what knowledge had Herodotus of the Indians ? and (b) how far his account of the Indo-Persian empire is authentic ?

(A)

Herodotus thinks that the Indians are the most remote nation living in the east, and beyond them is a desert. Herodotus knows nothing of the Gaṅges valley, nor does he know of the

great Himalayan chains. He knew, however, that 'there are many nations of Indians, and they do not speak the same language as each other ; some of them are nomads, and other not. Some inhabit the marshes of the river, and feed on raw fish, which they take going out in boats made of reeds ; one joint of the reed makes a boat. These Indians wear a garment made of rushes, which, when they have cut the reed from the river and beaten it, they afterwards paint like a mat and wear it like a corselet.'

Thus Herodotus knew that 'there are many nations of the Indians' and he enumerates some of them —

(i) 'Other Indians, living to the east of these (those enumerated above) are nomads and eat raw flesh ; they are called Padaeans.'

(ii) 'Other Indians have the following different custom : they never kill anything that has life, nor sow anything .....'

(iii) Herodotus knows further of the Indians who 'are situated very far from the Persians, towards the south, and were never subject to Darius.' From their description as given by Herodotus, some scholars think that the Dravidians are here referred to.

(iv) 'There are other Indians bordering on the city of Caspatyrus and the country of Pactyce, settled northward of the other Indians, whose mode of life resembles that of the Bactrians.'

Thus it appears that within the narrow limit of his 'Indian', Herodotus knew the different classes of the Indian peoples, even of those who lived beyond the empire of the Achaemenids. As Bunbury says 'The vague idea that all to the east of the Indians was a sandy desert probably arose in the first instance from the real fact of the occurrence of a board desert tract to the east of the fertile lands of the Indus, and would be confirmed by vague reports that similar deserts were found also to the east of Bactria and the adjoining countries.' Herodotus gives an interesting account of the gold digging ants which threw up mounds of gold-dust in the desert. 'In this desert, then, and in the sand, there are ants in size somewhat less indeed than dogs, but larger than foxes.' Wilson points out that mention is often made in *Mahābhārata* of

'that gold which is dug up by the pipīlakas (ants) and is therefore called Pippīlikas (ant-gold).' We shall have the occasion to comment on this account in the next section. Let us here say a few words about the different Indian peoples mentioned by the great historian.

Herodotus knew that 'the Indians are by far the greatest multitude of all the peoples of men whom we know,' but he had hardly any knowledge of the civilised Indians of the interior, specially of the Gangetic Valley. His Indians who lived in the swamps of the river and fed on raw fish, 'which they take going out in boats made of reeds,' seem to have been the inhabitants of the lower Indus Valley, for Lassen points out that in the Mianwali district 'mats and baskets are still made from the reeds of the river.'

The reference to cannibals, who are called Padaeans, is indeed interesting. Cannibalism may have existed, in some form or other, among the Gonds but there is absolutely no proof of its prevalence in the area which came under the knowledge of Herodotus. It is, on the other hand, not possible to equate the term Padaeans with any Indian name.

Herodotus further observes that the Indians living near the lands of the Pactyce and Caspatyrus were like the Bactrians in their mode of life. We have already indicated that this area was more Iranian than Indian even before the Achaemenid days, and this was partly because of the constant flow of nomads from beyond the Indian frontier. Thus the term Bālhika, which signifies also Bactria, became another name for the region of the Uttarāpatha. In the Great Epic, a powerful King of the Bālhikas, Darada by name, is called a *mahāsura* or a great Asura and this Bālhika-Darada is praised highly by Śiśupāla.[1] This shows indirectly the prevalence of the Bactrian culture in Dardistan and the adjoining areas.

The term Bālhika has sometimes, however, been confounded with Bāhika or the region where the Sindhu or Indus flows with its five tributaries. Thus Nīlakaṇṭha says, *Bālhikaḥ : Pañcānāṃ Sindhuṣaṣṭhānāṃ nadīnāṃ yatra saṃgamaḥ : Bālhikā*

[1] *Mbh*, I. 67.58; II. 44.80.

nāma te deśāḥ.'[1] In the Meherauli Pillar Inscription of King Candra the term Bālhika seems to have been used in this sense.

Herodotus' account of the Indians, who killed their own relatives on the approach of old age, seems to be a transference of Sogdian custom on the Indian soil, for we learn it on the authority of Plutarch that Alexander taught the Sogdians not to kill their fathers, while Strabo quotes Onesicritus to the effect that the people of Bactria had reared dogs who were trained to eat the dying, and Alexander, after he had conquered the country, put a stop to this practice.[2]

(B)

Let us now see how far Herodotus' account of the Indo-Achaemenid empire is authentic. We have already doubted the truth of the statement that Darius conquered the region of Sind after the exploration of the river Indus by Scylax and his party. Secondly, it has also been stated that the tribute list of Herodotus dates from his own time i.e., that of Artaxerxes II, and not from the time of Darius as it professes to be.

According to Herodotus, Darius received 360 talents in gold dust as the tribute of his Indian satrapy, and this was the largest amount paid by any other province of the empire. For an arid region like Sind this seems to be an utter impossibility, and Smith thinks that owing to the changes in the courses of the rivers since ancient times, 'vast tracts in the Sind and the Punjab, now desolate, were then rich and prosperous.' The statement seems to go too far, for as Cousens has shown, there were many different channels of the Indus, often altering and we do not really know anything.[3] A great geological change seems to have hardly occurred to alter the character of the soil.

Again, if Arrian is to be believed the party of Alexander did not find any gold worth mentioning in India.[4] Megasthenes

[1] Nīlakaṇṭha on *Mbh*, V. 39.80.
[2] Plutarch, *Moralia*, 328 c. Strabo, XI. 517.
[3] *MASI*, no. 46, pp. 3-6.
[4] Arrian, V. 4.4.

says that the Indians did not know even how to separate gold from dross. Though this statement is not strictly correct, for we have references to gold and gold-coins in the Vedic literature, it shows at any rate the scarcity of gold in the land. The epigraphs of Darius themselves also point to this direction. For building his palace at Susa, Darius imported ivory and teak-wood only from India, while he had to procure gold from the distant satrapies of Sardis and Bactria. Had gold been abundant in India, Darius must have procured it along with wood and ivory.

Herodotus speaks of the desert in India where ants dug out gold, but from his account it is difficult to determine the location of this sandy tract. Megasthenes informs us that this desert was of no great extent, and that the Derdai (Dards of Dardistan), a great tribe of the Indians, lived near this gold-producing region. This would point to Bactria, wherefrom Darius also procured his gold. Thus the gold-producing desert of India is a myth, and the high amount of gold-tribute paid by India, as maintained by Herodotus, cannot be true.

Herodotus' statement in X. 3. as to the number of the Indians is implicitly contradicted by Thucydides (II. 97. 5-6), who says that no nation in Europe or Asia could be compared with the Scyths. As Godley says, Thucydides' narrow Hellenism involves him in a double error : first, he does not know that the Scyths proper were a comparatively small race, and secondly, he ignores the great population of the east of which Herodotus has dimly heard.

The *History* of Herodotus stands in great contrast to the work of Ctesias which is full of old wives' tales and contains very little important for the study of Indo-Persian history. Ctesias of Cnidus (in Caria) was in his early life a Physician to Artaxerxes II, and he accompanied the Achaemenid monarch in his campaign against his brother Cyrus the younger. He composed a work called *Persica* in Ionian dialects, in opposition to Herodotus, and it is presumed that it was based on the Persian archives. The *Persica* consisted of 23 books containing accounts of rivers, of the Persian revenues, of India and of a history of Assyria and Persia. The work, however, is unfortunately lost, though we possess an abridgment of it by

Photius, and fragments in Athenaeus, Plutarch and especially Diodorus whose second book is mainly based on it. His *Indica*, however, is of little value, being full of absurd stories, and Prof. Bevan thinks that 'his contribution seems to have been the most worthless of all those which went to make up the Classical tradition'.[1]

[1] *CHI*, I, p. 39.

CHAPTER 7

The Achaemenids and India

THE Achaemenid rule east of the Hindukush came to an end in *c.* 330 BC., with the defeat of Darius III at the field of Arbela. Little remained in India which could in any sense be called distinctively Achaemenid after the advent of Alexander the Great who did not find even a Persian officer on the Indian soil. Alexander himself, however, behaved in Asia in the oriental fashion. He assumed oriental robes and married the daughter of Darius III. In India, he copied the Achaemenid system of administration of division of empire into satrapies, the most important among which, according to the Classical authors, were three in number : (a) Paropamisadai, to the west of the Indus ; (b) the satrapy of Pithon the son of Agenor, 'covering Sind from the Indus confluence to the ocean and extending westward to the Hab' ; (c) the satrapy of Philipos to the east of the river Indus. These satrapies thus included the three old Achaemenid provinces of 'India', Gandarii and Sattygidia ; and after the Persian fashion Alexander left the native *rājās*, specially Taxiles and Porus, in the enjoyment of their autonomy. According to Diodorus (XVIII. 3-4) they were recognised as virtually independent rulers.

Thus the Achaemenid empire was dead, but its ghost had been living. This satrapal system of government was again revived by the Scytho-Parthians with the emendation that a Great Satrap was associated with a satrap, usually his son, who succeed to the higher dignity in due course. These satraps enjoyed a considerable degree of independence, and two Satrapal Houses, those of Mathura and of Ujjayini, became independent and played an important role in the political and cultural

life of the land. The spirit of the old Achaemenid empire found shelter in India till the Śaka conquest of the Gupta monarch, Candragupta II.

The only town in the Achaemenid sphere which has been excavated, Taxila, has yielded some interesting results. An octagonal pillar of white marbel was discovered at Sirkap, containing an Aramaic inscription which has been examined by Herzfeld who read in it the word *Priyadarśana*.[1] Thus the inscription belongs to the Great Maurya emperor Aśoka. As Sir John Marshall observes : 'The discovery of this inscription is of special interest in connection with the origin of the Kharoṣṭhī alphabet, since it confirms the view that Kharoṣṭhī was derived at Taxila (which was the chief city of the Kharoṣṭhī district) from Aramaic, the latter having been introduced into the North-West of India by the Achaemenids after their conquest of the country about 500 BC.'[2]

The question whether Kharoṣṭhī originated in India or was originally the script of Kashgar was much debated,[3] and after the discovery of the Kharoṣṭhī documents in Central Asia it may be taken as finally settled. None of these documents are earlier than the Christian era, while, on the other hand, the epigraphs of Aśoka in the North Western India are all written in Kharoṣṭhī-script.

Buhler thinks that Kharoṣṭhī is the result of the intercourse between the officers of the satraps and of the native authorities, the Indian chiefs and the heads of towns and villages, whom, as the accounts of the state of the Punjab at the time of Alexader's invasions show, the Persians left in possession in consideration of the payment of tribute. At first the Indians probably used Aramaic characters, just as in later times they used the Arabic writing for a number of their dialects, and they introduced in course of time the modifications observable in the Kharoṣṭhī alphabet. This supposition of Buhler is indeed strengthened by the fact that the vowel system and the compound consonants in Kharoṣṭhī point to the fact that they

[1] *Ep. Ind.* XIX, p. 253.
[2] Marshall, *A Guide to Taxila*, p. 78.
[3] *Ind. Ant*, 1905. *BEFEO*, 1902, pp. 246 ff; 1904, pp. 543ff.

were elaborated with the help of Brāhmī which was the original script of the Indians and which prevails in most part of the country, while Kharoṣṭhī was used only in the region which once had passed under the foreign rule.

Something may now be said about trade. Kennedy has shown that as early as the seventh century BC, India had been maintaining commercial relationship with Assyria and Babylonia, and when the Western and the North-western India became part of an empire which extended in the west upto the Asia-Minor, this Indian trade naturally got a new impetus. The exploration of the Indus and the Arabian Sea by Scylax evidently opened a new water-route, and though it is only now and then that a few details can be obtained. the main fact is unquestionable. The *Baveru Jātaka*, which may be as old as the Achaemenid age, speaks of the adventures of certain Indian merchants, who first took peacock by sea to Babylon. On the evidence of the Susa inscription of Darius, we may infer that Indian ivory and teaks were popular in the Persian markets and Darius used them in the construction of his palace.[1]

Arrian informs us that on his way home by the sea, Nearchos, an admiral of Alexander's navy, got a guide in Gedrosia, who knew the coast as far as the Gulf of Ormuz.[2] The statement brings out the fact that in the Achaemenid age, Indian vessels were coasting along Gedrosia to Arabia and the Persian Gulf. The Indians of the western borderland possibly took a great part in this maritime trade, for the *Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra* (*c* 400 BC.) condemns *'samudra-samyānam'* as one of the five peculiar customs of the *'north-erners.'*

Two further points need consideration in this connection. In Sind, Nearchos was detained for twenty four days in a secured harbour, to which he gave the name of Alexander's Haven. This harbour was certainly not a Greek creation, for it was already there at the time of Nearchos' voyage. It is difficult to

[1] The presence of the Indians in Babylonia is further proved by the fact that 'in the tenth year of Darius a Babylonian slave woman was called the Bahtarian (Bactrian) ; four years later she was more accurately known as the Gandarian'. (Olmstead, *l. c.*, p. 144, fn. 37)

[2] *Indica*, 27.1

determine when the harbour was built up, but in any case it seems to be a fact that it had been in use in the Achaemenid days. It is probable that it was built up by the Persians after the exploration of the Indus by Scylax and his party. Secondly, we learn that Nearchos could not proceed further from this place due to unfavourable winds. This is an indication that the Indo-Achaemenids of those days knew the nature of the monsoon winds and navigated the sea accordingly. Nearchos, in fact, waited a month till the 'Etesian winds', the South-west monsoon, ceased, late September or early October. and till he got the North-east monsoon in November. Indians had certainly known of it long before the Greeks, though they might have used it for coast voyages only.

It was as a result of the Achaemenid conquest that a new industry of blanket-making developed in the Indian border-land. The Kambojas, we have already seen, were an Iranian people, and Yāska says that '*the Kambojas (are so called because) they enjoy blankets (kambala) or beautiful things.*' The blankets or *kambalas* manufacturad by the Kamboja people are referred to in the *Mahābhārata* which states that at the great Rājasūya sacrifice, the Kamboja king presented to Yudhiṣṭhira many of the best kinds of skin, woollen blankets made of the fur of animals living in burrows in the earth, and also of cats - all inlaid with threads of gold'; and again we read : 'The king of Kamboja sent to him hundred of thousands of black, dark and red skins of the deer called Kadali and also blankets (*Kambalas*) of excellent texture'.[1] This account of the Kamboja reminds us of *Ūrṇā-vikraya* as one of the condemnable customs of the 'northerners' mentioned in the *Baudhyāana-Dharmasūtra*. But why does Bodhāyana condemn the custom ? Evidently because it was a practice in a barbarous country. It has already been noted that the region extending from Kāpisa to Kamboja was more Iranian than Indian. In the seventh century, the Chinese traveller Yuan Chwang also noted the barbarous habits of the people of this region, and states that 'from the country of Lan-po (Laghman) till this (Rājapura), the men are of a coarse appearance, their disposition fierce and

[1] *Mbh*, II. 51 3 ; 48,19.

passionate, their language vulgar and uncultivated, with scarce any manners or refinement. They do not properly belong to India, but are frontier people, with barbarous habit.'[1]

Two peculiar customs characterised the people of this region, viz., *the drinking of wine and taming of horses*. Bodhāyana condemns both of them—*sidhupānam* and *ubhayatodantirvyavahāra*—as customs of the '*northerners*'.

Pāṇini in one of his sūtras refers to the grapes of the Kāpiśa country known as 'Kāpiśāyanī' and also the wine of the country called 'Kāpiśāyana'. Kauṭilya in his *Arthaśāstra* also refers to the wine of the Kāpiśa country. In fact, the habit of drinking wine seems to have been prevalent in other parts of the Achaemenid India as well. If the Great Epic is to be believed, all the people of the Śākala country, modern Sialkot and possibly the earliest home of the Śakas in India, were in the habit of drinking wine. So it seems that the W. Punjab and the N.W.F.P. were the homes of the branded custom of *sidhupānam* in the ancient period, the regions which fell within the domain of the Achaemenids.

As regards the taming and selling of horses, we may note that the country of Kamboja was specially famous for its horses in ancient India. The *Mahābhārata* is full of references to the horses of the Kamboja country, while the Jaina *Uttarādhyāyana Sūtra* states that no horse could compete with a trained horse of Kamboja. The Kamboja horses are again referred to in the Monghyr Copper-plate of Devapāla.

Prof. Bevan points out that the name Assakenoi is connected with the Sanskrit *aśva*, and Iranian *aspa*, horse. The very name then shows that the country of the Assakenoi was famous for its horses. The territory occupied by the tribe was also known as Udyāna or Oḍḍiyana in the Swat valley. In the T'ang Annals the boundaries of Oḍḍiyāna or Yue-ti yien are given as follows ; India is on the south; Chitral is on the north-west and it is situated to the north of the river Indus.[2] The Classical authors inform us that at the time of Alexander's invasion the

[1] Beal, *Buddhist Records of the Western World*, I, p. 164.

[2] Chavannes, *Documents etc.*, p. 160.

king of this country was Assakenoi while his wife's name was Kleophis.

It has already been noted that as a result of the Achaemenid conquest, the Magi or the Magas came and settled in India and they introduced into this country two great changes, viz., the system of cousin-marriage[1] and a form of Sun-worship.[2] These two then may be regarded as the indirect consequences of the Achaemenid conquest of India.

According to some scholars the practice of exposing the dead to the birds of prey, common in Taxila,[3] was introduced into India by the Magians after the Achaemenid conquest of

[1] The earliest reference to cousin-marriage in India is to be found in the *Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra*. Kumārila Bhaṭṭa informs us that the people of the 'South' are overjoyed to get the daughters of their maternal uncle (Kumārila Bhaṭṭa as quoted by Govindasvāmin on Bodhāyana, Mysore ed., p. 8). Buhler points out that 'the marriage between cousins occur among the Karhada Brāhmaṇas of the Dekhan'. We learn from the epigraphic records that the system of cousin-marriage was also in vogue amongst the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Mālkhed. Jagatuṅga, the predeceased son of Kṛṣṇa II, had married a daughter of his maternal uncle Saṃkaragaṇa. The same was the case with Indra IV (*Ep. Ind*, VII, p. 38).

[2] The Magas made a great contribution of their own by introducing into the country a new form of Sun-worship. Varāhamihira in his *Bṛhat Saṃhitā* tells us, that the installation and the consecration of the images and temples of the Sun should be caused to be made by the Magas who were regarded as the Brāhmaṇas of the Śaka community. Plate LVI, in Burgess' *Architectural Antiquities of Northern Gujarat* shows that this Sun-god has boots reaching up to the knees ; and a girdle round the waist with one end hanging downwards. The dress of the god is entirely Scythian. Many such temples with idols may have been coustructed in India under the influence of the Śaka or Maga priests. The Indian conception of the Sun-god is entirely different and stands in great contrast to that of the Magians. We may compare, for example, the figure of the Magian Sun-god, with his boot and girdle with the rock-cut relief figure of the Sun at Bhaja which is approximately of the second century BC 'The Sun god with his consorts in a chariot is escorted by riders on either of the two surfaces, at a right angle of the rock. Animals' and birds' heads disentangle themselves from the heaving mass of the but faintly differentiated relief on the left surface. But even when the shape becomes articulate the modelling retains its heaving quality, and the figure of the demon, with its bulging body, is entirely borne by a plastic imagination.' (Kramrisch, *Indian Sculptures*, p. 160).

[3] Smith, *Early History of India*, 3rd ed., p. 135 n.

the country. The *Mahāsīlava Jātaka* and the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* bear clear reference to it. The Chinese account, on the other hand, avers the presence of this practice among the Licchavis, and this has given rise to various theories regarding the origin of the tribe. Thus Dr. Vidyabhusana observes: 'It appears to me very probable that while about 515 BC., Darius, King of Persia, sent an expedition to India, or rather caused the Indus to be explored from the land of the Pakhtu (Afghans) to its mouth, some of his Persian subjects in Nisibis (off Herat) immigrated to India, and having found the Punjab overpopulated by the orthodox Brāhmaṇas, came down as far as Magadha (Bihar) which was at that time largely inhabited by Vrātyas or outcaste people.[1] This theory has been severely criticised by the later scholars, and indeed there is absolutely no evidence that the Persians in the Achaemenid days advanced as far as the Eastern India. The presence of the custom of exposing the dead to the birds of prey, however, requires explanation.

The *Āpastamba Dharmasūtra* refers to the customs of burial and exposure of the dead on a raised platform. The *Atharvaveda* also refers to similar practices: 'They that are buried, and they that are scattered away, they that are burned and they that are set up—all those Fathers, O Agni, bring thou to eat the oblation'[2]

Thus it would appear that the system of exposing the dead was prevalent among a section of the Aryans from a very remote period. In his *Vedic Antiquities*, Prof. Dubreuil claims to have discovered several funeral remains of the Vedic age; but, in any case, the system of *Dakhama* in India cannot be ascribed to the Persian sources. The system seems to have been in existence among the Aryans in their early home in Central Asia.

The two peoples, the Indians and the Persians, were thus living side by side in close contact and naturally there must have

[1] *Ind. Ant.*, 1908, p 79.

[2] *Āpastamba Dharmasūtra*, I. 87. *Atharva Veda*, XVIII. 2.34.

been mutual borrowing. We know what little Indians took because we have the Indian literature and epigraphic records, but it is difficult to determine what the Persians took because our 'sources' are lost. Alberuni's statement that Buddhism flourished in Western Asia before the spread of Zoroastrianism which supplanted the former[1] remains uncorroborated, and the account can hardly be accepted in the present state of our knowledge.

Spooner in his *Zoroastrian Period of Indian History* has traced Persian influences in different spheres of Indian life; but that most of his conclusions are far-fetched will be apparent from the criticisms that followed the publication of his article.[2] Further, in this thesis of ours, we have to distinguish between the factors that are 'Persian' from those that are Achaemenid,' for the fusion of Persian with Hellenistic ideas took place in Bactria and the neighbouring countries after their colonisation by Alexander the Great, and this hybrid culture thus evolved was introduced into India either as a result of the peaceful intercourse between the Mauryan empire and Western Asia, or as a result of the subsequent invasions of the Bactrian Greeks, Scythians, Parthians, and Kuṣāṇas, all of whom must have been imbued to a greater or lesser degree with Graeco-Persian culture. Hence, it will be wrong to

[1] Sachau, *Alberuni's India, I*, p. 21.

[2] Spooner, D. B., *The Zoroastrian period of Indian History, JRAS*, 1915, pp. 63-89, 405-55; see also in this connection *Annual Report* of the Archaeological Survey of India, Eastern Circle, 1913-14, pp. 45ff. These accounts are based on discoveries made at Pāṭaliputra and the adjoining regions. Smith was first to challenge the theories put forth in the above articles in *JRAS*, 1915, pp. 800-2. He pointed out that there is no doubt that Persian influence can be detected in early Indian culture, but the theories of Spooner were 'somewhat daring speculations'. In the next year Keith, F.W. Thomas and Nimrod severely attacked Spooner's theories. In *JRAS*, 1916, Keith adduced several points opposing the theory of Zoroastrain period of Indian history (pp. 138-43), while Thomas accepts the interpretation of *asura* Maya and of Mount Meru, but is sceptic about other views (pp. 362-6). In the *Modern Review* Nimrod totally rejects all these theories. From a perusal of Spooner's articles and the criticisms against the same it appers that Spooner really went too far with his theories.

assume that all the Persian elements in the Indian culture found their way into India at the time when the Persian empire extended over the North-west, the Greek elements following later.[1]

Senart has traced Achaemenid influence in the preambles to the Aśokan edicts. The epigraphs of Aśoka begin with the uniform phrase : '*Thus saith King Piyadasi, dear unto the devas.*' Now, this formulae is an absolutely isolated example in Indian epigraphy, and makes its appearance with the Aśokan edicts, and after them appears no more, 'inspite of the influence which the example of so powerful a sovereign would be expected to exercise.' In the entire series of the inscriptions of the Achaemenid monarchs from Darius to Artaxerxes we find, on the other hand the phrase *thatiy Dāraya vaush Kṣayathiya*, 'thus said the King Darius,' or its equivalent, *thatiy Kṣayarasha* inevitably forming the frame of each of the proclamations. In both the cases, this phrase in the third person is immediately succeeded by the use of first person, and thus we are led to infer that the Great Maurya emperor copied his Achaemenid brethren in making his proclamations.[2]

The inference is supported by other facts as well. The word *dipi* is used in the Kharoṣṭhī proclamation of the Maurya king to designate the inscriptions, while the engraving is called *ni-pish*. This is exactly a copy of Darius' inscriptions where we read '*imam dipim nipishtanaīy*', while Aśoka writes '*ayi Dhammadipi nipiṣṭa.* 'In the Brāhmī records instead of '*dipi*' we have got '*lipi*' which is but a modification of the Iranian term '*dipi.*'

The question of Irano-Achaemenid influence on Indian art is a vexed one. The Iranian art after Artaxerxes II shows 'an astoundingly quick decline, an unparalleled fall, to the point that even the mere technique was almost entirely lost. Old Persian art was dead before Alexander conquered Persia, and with the art the whole culture died : This complete decay was the cause, the conquest was its consequence. The burning of Persepolis by Alexander was only the symbolic expression of

1 Marshall, *A Guide to Taxila*, p. 24.

2 *Ind. Ant*, XX, pp. 255-60.

the fact that the Ancient East had died.'[1]

Thus the presence of the Persian elements in the Indian art should properly be ascribed to the Graeco-Persian source than to the Achaemenids themselves. We may leave out at the outset the question of Achaemenid influence on Indian sculpture for 'architecture was the dominating art at the Achaemenian epoch ; sculpture was subordinate to it, and was as a matter of fact part of the architecture.'[2] Indeed, in the Achaemenid epoch every single one of the principles of the Iranian sculpture was deliberately chosen to subordinate sculpture to architecture to create the perfect unity of the colossal buildings ; the sculpture had no independent existence.

It was believed that the lion-figures of the Mauryan age drew their inspiration from the lion of Hamadan which was taken to be a work of the Achaemenid period. The theory must now be discarded for it has been conclusively proved that the lion of Hamadan belongs to the Arsacidan and Sassanid periods.

Taxila, the great city of the Achaemenid, may have imbibed some Achaemenid influence as shown by an Aramaic inscription discovered there by Sir John Marshall. A few minor antiquities found in the Bhir mound show traces of the influence of the Achaemenid art, which possibly reached India after the conquest of Alexander the Great.

How far the Achaemenid model travelled into the interior of India beyond the borders of the Indo-Achaemenid empire cannot be properly determined. Iranian influence has been traced in the Mauryan sculptures, the Mauryan palace discovered at Kumrāhār, and the Aśokan pillars.

It has already been said that in the art of the Achaemenid age the sculpture had no independent existence, and hence it follows *a priori* that the few objects of sculptures that can be assigned to the Maurya age had hardly anything Iranian in them. It is possible, however, that the art of giving lustrous polish to the stone was learnt by the Indians from the Graeco-Persians who also possibly taught the natives the art of

[1] Herzfeld, *Iran in the Ancient East*, p. 274,
[2] *Ibid*, 222.

moulding stones. Burgess thinks, however, that these objects are typically Aśokan.

The excavations at Kumrāhār by Waddell and Spooner led to the discovsry of Mauryan palace, the Sugāṅga palace mentioned in the Hathigumpha inscription of King Khāravela according to Jayaswal, which, it is supposed, was built on the model of the throne room and palace of Darius at Persepolis. Dr. Spooner's view regarding the design and purpose of the Hall at Pāṭaliputra find some confirmation in a clay seal recovered at the site which depicts such a three-storied hall as he predicts.

To understand the full significance of Spooner's theory, we must note in brief the account of the 'Persepolitan capital' as given by the archaeologists. As Herzfeld says, 'The building of Persepolis started soon after Darius' accession in c. 520. As long as he reigned, the place was no more than a great builder's yard, and under Xerxes the constructions were still going on all over the place. It was never entirely completed, but after Artaxerxes I had finished the Hall of a Hundred Columns it was more or less ready for use. However, traces of actual occupation are comparatively scanty, and Ktesias, who lived twenty years as physician at the court of Artaxerxes II, evidently was never there. It remained entirely unknown to the Greeks before Alexander conquered it. On the whole Persepolis seems to have been a place that was founded and kept for historical and sentimental reasons in the homeland of the dynasty but used for only special ceremonial occasions.'

From the above observations, it is evident that the Indians probably knew nothing of the great palace during the rule of the Achaemenids. Its story may have circulated in India after the conquest of Alexander, but there is no direct proof that the Mauryan court intentionally copied the pattern of the Iranian model. There are again fundamental differences between the two palaces, as shown by several critics of Spooner's theories.

Further the expression 'Hall of the Hundred Columns' is a misnomer, for there were about 500 columns on the terrace alone. The comparison between the two seems to have been first started by the Iranians themselves, but Aelian makes the pointed remark: 'methinks, only the well-known vanity of

the Persians could prompt such a comparison.'

The question of Iranian influence on the Mauryan columns has been much discussed and those who hold that they are entirely of Indian origin point out that : (i) the Persian columns are made up of various materials—lime-stone of good quality, artificial stone, burnt brick, crude brick, a hard kind of plaster white and hard as stone, while the Aśokan columns are invariably made of monolithic grey sand stone ; (ii) unlike the Persian columns, the Mauryan columns have no base ; (iii) unlike any thing such found in the Persian columns, the lower elements of all abaci in India are lotus, represented with extraordinary realism ; (iv) the Aśokan entablature is almost always, zoophorus, and the Sarnath lions, placed in close juxtaposition, are contrary to the Persian designs.

Thus it is difficult to decide how far the Indian art is indebted for its motifs and inspirations to the Achaemenid Iran. The edict bearing pillar at Sanchi has also been dubbed as Perso-Greek in style, not Indian, and there are reasons to believe that many of the Mauryan monuments were the handiwork of foreign, probably Bactrian, artists who were too much influenced by the Persian models. Thus though these monuments are essentially Indian, still we can trace in them some foreign elements. As Sir John Marshall has said, "In the time of Aśoka indigenous art was still in the rudimentary state, when the sculptor could not grasp more than one aspect of his subject at a time, when the law of 'frontality' was still binding upon him, and when the 'memory picture' had not yet given place to direct observation of nature". The influence of the dead Persian art came, if it came at all, to India—rejuvenated through the Greeks.[1]

It has been suggested that the great Maurya royal road with milestones on it was constructed after the Achaemenid model. This is quite possible for the Persian kings, we know, covered their empire by a network of roads that opened a new chapter in the history of trade and commerce of Western and

[1] For the question of Achaemenid influence on the Mauryan Art, see also Ray, *Maurya and Śuṅga Art*, Calcutta University, 1945.

Central Asia. As Przyluski says : 'From Mauryan times onwards Pāṭaliputra was connected with Gandhāra by an imperial highway, drawn on the model of the great roads of the Achaemenids. It played a great part in the political and economic life of India. After the foundation of the Greek kingdom of Bactriana commercial intercourse became very active between the valleys of the Ganges and the Oxus.........From Pāṭaliputra three great roads radiated to the frontiers of the Empire—the south-western to Barygaza by Kauśāmbī and Ujjayini, the northern to Nepal by Vaiśālī and Śrāvastī, and the north-western, the longest, to Bactriana by Mathura and Upper-valley of the Indus.'[1]

It was evidently after this great road, *patha*, of Northern India that the region came to be known as the Uttarāpatha. The term Uttarāpatha has, however, been often used in a much restricted sense to signify the region lying on the other side of Pṛthudaka or Pehoa,[2] and inhabited by the Gandhāras, the Yonas, the Kambojas and other barbarous tribes. Now, at least a part of this region formed a part of the Achaemenid empire, and this area acquired the name of Uttarāpatha at an early age, evidently from the fact that some of the Achaemenid or pre-Achaemenid roads ran through it.

[1] J. Przyluski, *La legende de l'empereur Aśoka*, p. 9. Jolly, *Arthaśāstra*, p. 44.

[2] Rājaśekhara, *Kāvyamīmāṃsā*, ch. xvii, p. 93.

CHAPTER 8

Conclusion

OUR task of giving a comprehensive picture of the Achaemenids in India has now come to an end, only a few words are necessary by way of epilogue.

The Achaemenids of Iran extended their sway into India and this brought a revolutionary change in the history of the land. It unlocked to the people of greater Asia and Europe a new world, and inspired a hero of Macedon with an endeavour to conquer it. Indeed, there would hardly have been Alexander's invasion of the country, had not the Achaemenids conquered it beforehand, for Alexander did not traverse Asia beyond the limits of that empire. Alexander was a true successor of the Achaemenids and he held in his own hand the torch of Iranian culture to light the darkness that had already been shrouding inspite of the best efforts of the Persian monarchs. Politically, the Achaemenids were less successful in India than the Greeks, the Śakas or the Kuṣāṇas, but they had to their credit the unique achievement of acquainting India to the outer world from where nomads henceforth began pouring into that fertile golden land. Indeed, the history of foreign rule in India from the time of Alexander to that of the Ephthalites is nothing but an appendix to the old Indo-Achaemenid history.

Thus India came into contact with various traditions more than had formerly been the case, and the result was naturally a widening of the scope of intellectual activity and the breaking of the fetters of traditionalism. The contributions of the Achaemenids peep to a large extent into the golden age of the Mauryas. If human progress is indebted to those who are instrumental in propagating the culture developed by other nations and in transposing ideas and institutions from people to people, India must admit her debt to Achaemenid Iran.

Appendix 1

THE GOLD QUESTION

HERZFELD in his *Iran in the Ancient East*, p. 272, has given two very important plates of Xerxes' tribute procession (Pls. lxxix and lxxx), one showing 'the Thattagush (Sattagydians with weapons and a marvellous humped-bull,' and the other) depicting 'the Hindus from Sind with gold, double axes and a beautiful ass.'

An examination of pl. lxxx reveals that the Hindus are carrying some rectangular slabs in their hands, and they may or may not be slabs of gold. We have already tried to show that the account of Herodotus regarding gold-tribute paid by the 'Indians' is much exaggerated, and there is hardly any reason for supposing that gold was abundant in India. The slabs in question may represent ivory blocks which, we know, Darius imported from 'India' for the construction of his palace at Susa.

McDonald's theory[1] that 'gold was abundant there (India), so abundant that for many centuries its value relatively to silver was extraordinarily low' is not supported by the facts at our disposal. The evidence of the Classical authors, already

[1] *CHI*, I, p. 307 : 'The standard gold coin of Ancient Persia was the daric, which are upon the obverse a figure of the Great King hastening through his dominions, armed with bow and spear; and upon the reverse an irregular oblong incuse. It weighed aout 130 grains (8·42 grammes), and was in all probability first minted by Darius Hystaspes, the monarch who was responsible for adding the valley of the Indus to the empire. From its infancy, therefore, the daric would have ready access to the country beyond the Hindu Kush. At the same time there was an important economic reason which would militate against its extensive circulation in these regions.'

shown, is conclusive on the point. As Tarn says : 'The only native Indian gold of any account came from the washings on the upper Ganges and its tributaries which are referred to by Megasthenes and Pliny and probably (later) by the *Bṛhat Saṃhitā*. In fact Indians knew next to nothing about gold-mining ; Alexander's mining engineer Gorgos, who opened a silver mine in the Salt-Range in Sopeithes' kingdom whence came Sopeithes' unique silver coinage, said that Indian ideas of mining and refining were elementary, and Megasthenes said that they did not even know how to separate gold from dross. Essentially, India's gold was imported and so had to be paid for like other commodities ; the North-west got its gold from Siberia, the East probably imported some gold from the very rich river washings in Yunnan and the neighbouring provinces.'[1]

THE KAMBOJAS

It has been asserted by several scholars that (a) the Kambojas were an Indian people, and that (b) their territory figures as one of the Indian janapadas in the age prior to the time of the Lord Buddha. Let us see how far the assertions are correct.

The Kambojas are not mentioned in the *Ṛgveda*, a fact which shows that they came late in India. The *Vaṃśa Brāhmaṇa*

[1] *l.c.*, p. 108. In this connection we may note the following observations of Olmstead throwing light on the economic condition of the Achaemenid empire : 'Little of the vast sum (collected from India and other districts of the empire) was ever returned to the satrapies. It was the custom to melt down the gold and silver and to pour it into jars which were then broken and the bullion stored. Only a small portion was ever coined-and then usually for the purchase of foreign soldiers or of foreign statesmen. Thus, despite the precious metals newly mined, the empire was rapidly drained of its gold and silver ; our Babylonian documents clearly witness a lessened use of the precious metals. For a time, credit made possible a continuance of business, but the insensate demand for actual silver in the payment of taxes drove the landlords in increasing numbers to the loan sharks, who gave money in exchange for the pledge—the actual use of the field or the slave, whose services were thus lost until the improbable redemption. As coined money became a rarity, hoarded by the loan sharks, credit increased the inflation, and rapidly rising prices made the situation still more intolerable.' (*l.c.*, p. 298)

of the *Sāma Veda* mentions a teacher named Kamboja Aupamayava. This fixes up the date of the work which must be ascribed to the post-Cambyses age. A higher antiquity has generally been given to the work, and thus it has been sought to prove that the Kambojas came to India at a very early date. The account of the people as given in the *Nirukta* proves conclusively that they were Iranians. The fact that Kātyāyana had to make *vārtika* on Pāṇini's rule 'Kambojā-luk' shows that like the Colas, Keralas etc., the Kambojas were too well-known to the Father of the Sanskrit grammar, although he had been living in the nearby region. And the only reason of this ignorance was that they had only recently settled in India, too recently to be acquainted with the Indo-Aryans themselves.

In the list of the *Solasa mahājanapada* furnished by the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* we find the mention of Kamboja. Rhys Davids opined that it represents a picture of the age just before the rise of Buddhism. Now, the date of Buddha's *parinirvāṇa* is uncertain. According to the Ceylonese tradition the event took place in 544 BC, while according to a Cantonese tradition in 486 BC. In any case, it is certain that the trans-Indus regions were conquered by Cyrus who ruled from BC 558 to 530 BC. So if Rhys Davids is to be followed the date of the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* list must be pushed to a period prior to 544 BC or 486 BC. If the name Kamboja be associated with Cambyses, as Levi has shown, then the date of the list must be later than 530 BC, when already the North-western region of India had become a part of the Achaemenid empire. It must be remembered, however, that the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* is giving us a list of the countries, not a list of the governments. So Gandhāra and Kamboja mentioned in it may very well be the two units of the Persian empire.[1]

[1] If the account of the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* be a conventional one, then of course we cannot draw any inference out of it. It may be noted that the *Mahāvastu* (i. 34) 'gives a similar list but omits Gandhāra and Kamboja, substituting in their place Śibi and Daśārṇa... ...the Jaina *Bhagvatī Sūtra* gives a slightly different list of the sixteen *Mahājanapadas*.' (*PHAI*, p. 81).

Bibliographical Index

General Index